

## Preface

In 1995 I received my MA in English, Composition and Rhetoric, from Eastern Washington University (EWU) in Cheney, Washington near Spokane. This was a teaching degree designed to train me for teaching writing at the community college level, but I initially had no intention of teaching. I had come into the program almost 14 years after receiving my BFA in Communication Arts (primarily Speech and Theatre) from Pacific Lutheran University (PLU) in Tacoma, Washington, to improve my own writing, intending to work primarily as a socio-political writer.

The dilemma early in this program was that halfway through my first quarter, in the spring of 1993, sitting in a traditional grammar course taught Dr. Marc Lester, I realized I couldn't possibly do the rhetoric aspect of my degree any justice without comparing and contrasting the rhetorical standards of English and those of other languages; there were just too many first-language speakers of other languages in this country to expect every person coming to a piece of my future writing to automatically understand the thrust of whatever my topic might be. By that time, too, I had realized that I might also enjoy teaching, and the inter-language, inter-cultural rhetoric problem was going to be even more pronounced in the classroom. I felt I needed a background in bridging the gaps, and the only way to get that at EWU was to take the four core classes of the English as a Second Language (ESL) MA teaching degree as my electives for my composition and rhetoric degree. This turned into five classes, as the director of the ESL master's program, Dr. LaVona Reeves, and a colleague of hers in anthropology put together an experimental course in psycholinguistics.

By the time of the psycholinguistics course I had determined to make the comparative rhetoric and linguistics the basis of my professional paper (my program's equivalent of a thesis) and had named Reeves to direct my project, despite the fact that she was going into her tenure year when I would be in the bulk of the writing. This turned out to be a boon to my study and research, however, as LaVona and I disagreed on some matters of basic language-learning theory, such as Critical Age Theory (now commonly referred to as Critical Period Hypothesis), plus we had to use some interesting rhetoric methods ourselves just to accomplish all the necessary conferences on my project.

These decisions had come out of a five-week professional seminar for teachers generally already in the classroom that I took as my second quarter during the summer of 1993. Reeves had come in for a two-day demonstration of working with foreign languages and their speakers. At one point, she instructed us each to write for ten minutes in any language other than English that we knew, or in English for those who were monolingual (which was one teacher in the class). We were to write whatever came off our pens, essentially without stopping for correction, just to see what came out. This was a process we learned later in my program, called "free writing" (a tool for dealing with, among other things, "writer's block"), but which Reeves tended to call "mind spill" whenever teaching it.

During that ten minutes I wrote in German, my known but unused second language, and discovered that words I hadn't used in over ten years came flowing off my pen properly constructed and in proper syntax. This was an immediate lesson in what the mind retains of language and language learning, and it did two things for me: it triggered memories of my own early language learning and that of my two sons, and this subsequently made me aware of

some flaws in language-learning theory and education that later became painfully clear in my disagreements with Reeves over Critical Age Theory and with some of the concepts presented in the psycholinguistics course.

I won't be discussing these extensively here, because the groundwork of my actual professional paper must be laid, after which I will publish a subsequent book based upon my further observations, research, and conclusions since receiving my MA in 1995. In this second book I shall discuss the further development of my ideas and ideals regarding language learning and instruction, social and instructional languages, and the rhetoric involved. I will demonstrate the practical experience of why I have become even more adamant against such fallacies as Critical Age Theory and their application (at least regarding second-language acquisition), as well as why I now challenge some of my own earlier thinking as equally limited and why I support now more than ever a fully multilingual society and educational system.

The foundation, however, is my professional paper from 1995, which is presented here unaltered from its original form, except for formatting concerns relating to consistency in reading and spacing for the 2013 reader. I have double justified the text margins, though the APA standard of the day was to justify the left margin only, as this is what people are used to reading in trade books. I have standardized longer quotes so they are more consistently set apart from the main text, rather than some being buried within the text (as was the APA standard of the day). Additionally, I originally used the standard of the day of double-spacing between sentences, but have noticed that everything I now read is single-spaced between sentences, so I have shifted the text to this standard. I have refigured the pagination in the Table of Contents to reflect the actual pagination of the current edition, rather than that of the original, so as to avoid confusing the current reader.

I, also, have corrected a few typographical errors in the original text.

Also, it needs to be noted that as this Essay was presented originally in 1995, the references in it are dated. This, however, can be overlooked in context, particularly given the continuing debate which has transpired since and become even more divided and virulent at times, both regarding English as a primary or official language in this country and regarding immigration laws. It also should be considered that I shall be following this project in the not-too-distant future with the additional book mentioned above, which shall include much more recent references.

Finally, in regards to the two original case studies included in the current volume, it should be noted that I have recorded them as they occurred, with interrupted thoughts and sentences, vocalized pauses, grammatical mis-speak in context, and the like. Thus, they are filled with ellipses, particularly in the case of the conversation with Celia. I believe this more clearly demonstrates the actual conversational use of language by my two subjects, as well as some of my own, and this should help demonstrate some of my points.

David Trotter  
Seattle, Washington, USA  
January, 2017

## Abstract

Over the past 500 years, a debate has raged in America over whether immigrants' cultures and languages should be allowed to exist alongside the "native" culture and language of the "host" country to which the immigrants have emigrated, whether they should be subordinated or replaced by the "host" culture and language, or whether they should be allowed to dominate and replace the "native" culture and language.

Growing out of this debate, this essay deals with the cultural, linguistic, and social alienation that occurs when one is set aside, ostracized, or made an outsider because of one's culture, language, or skin color. Specifically, it covers multilingual education and the surrounding social issues in terms of cultural identity versus assimilation.

This essay takes a position sometimes politically correct; sometimes politically unpopular; sometimes in agreement with past writers, researchers, and autobiographers; sometimes at odds with these same people.

Throughout this document, I take issue with the avid assimilationists and with the Official English/English Only movement.

After an extensive historical review, I focus on the work of Richard Rodriguez, who is openly opposed to bilingual education and suggests that assimilation is the only viable option, and on the writing of Gloria Anzaldúa, who advocates full multilingualism and multiculturalism.

I then move into two original cases studies which, along with Anzaldúa's experience, demonstrate that it is possible to maintain one's native language and culture even while learning and using the common language (in this case Standard American English) in school.

Finally, I suggest a balance between the common language and comparative rhetoric in education, a balance

between monolingual education and a multilingual society. This balance is founded in the results of the two case studies, as compared with the experiences of Anzaldúa and Rodriguez, and is closely tied to the National Language Policy of the Conference on College Composition and Communication to the English Plus movement.

## Acknowledgments

As with any work, only the author's name appears on this one. but along the way there have been contributions by a few people whom I wish to acknowledge.

Initially, this Professional Essay would not have been completed as it is without the constant prodding and questioning of Dr. LaVona Reeves, Assistant Professor of English at Eastern Washington University, as my Committee Chair. She has challenged me not only through the preparation of this document, but in several classes where my whole concept of language learning has been tested and reformed.

Secondly, Dr. Dana Elder, Professor of English at Eastern Washington University, as the director of my program, has challenged and encouraged me in my pursuit of contrastive and comparative rhetoric and, as the second reader for this Essay, has guided me through an academic administrative system which I often found foreign.

Dr. Larry Beason, Assistant Professor of English at Eastern Washington University, also has guided my interest in contrastive and comparative rhetoric, as well as placing high demands on my sometimes untamed writing style.

I am particularly grateful to Dr. Golie Jansen, Assistant Professor of Social Work at Eastern Washington University, who recommended Gloria Anzaldúa's work, and to Heather Clemens, a fellow graduate student, who directed me toward Richard Rodriguez's *Days of Obligation: An Argument with My Mexican Father* and the Postrel and Gilespie interview with Rodriguez.

Lynda Booth, another fellow graduate student, has especially encouraged my pursuit of the topic of this Essay, teases me about my love of research, and is looking forward to reading the final product.

I am additionally indebted to the staff of the Eastern Washington University Writers' Center, for tolerating my

somewhat obsessive use of the computers early in the writing of this document, and to the staff of JFK Memorial Library, who have endured massive book checkouts, unmentionable overdues and the resulting computer hassles, and endless copy requests.

Without any one of these people, this document would be far less than it is.



## Statement of Language Background and Educational Philosophy

My linguistic, cultural, and educational philosophies are founded initially in my having grown up with a mother who believed and taught the diversity of religious views in the world as so many different faces of a larger structure, as parts of a complete whole, each having its place and contributing to that whole.

This thinking led me ultimately to explore general metaphysics, storytelling, Native American Shamanism, Tibetan Buddhism, and a reading knowledge of Wicca, Zoroastrianism, and the Indo-European goddess religions as alternate faces of the greater structure I had come to know through thirty years of Christian reading, learning, and teaching.

It also carried over into my learning of German in high school and in my undergraduate work, where I came one course short of a Bachelor of Arts degree in German, as well as the study of Tibetan (with a smattering of Sanskrit) in my late thirties.

Along the way, I have come to value the diverse cultures, beliefs, and languages of the world and of the American melting pot (discussed at length herein) as immeasurably rich and intrinsically linked and inseparable.

Thus, I come to an understanding of rhetoric and of education as an exploration of possibilities and as a comparison/contrast – primarily comparison – of diverse experiences. It is not my intention in this exploration and comparison to separate the inseparable into distinct, untouching, isolated entities, but to further the blending, with distinction, of which Rodriguez and Anzaldúa write.

## Introduction

There are many forms of rhetoric and almost as many uses, but one thing is consistent across all rhetoric: its persuasive nature. Rhetoric can be simply defined as the use of words, gestures, facial expressions, body language, and media by one person or group of people to influence another person or group of people. Rhetoric exists for the purpose of molding and shaping others' ideas, actions, and world in order to maintain control of one's own world.

The uses of rhetoric are no more apparent than in the formation, development, and maintenance of social and cultural values, structures, practices, and norms. People use rhetoric to establish in each others' minds what is acceptable behavior and to ensure that such behavior is, in fact, what is practiced between people.

But communication often breaks down, and struggle for understanding or outright conflict results. This is particularly true when the parties involved in a given communication come from different cultural or linguistic backgrounds. Often different cultures have varying rhetorical expectations, such as the directness of American argumentation versus the circumspect narrative style of the Japanese. Such conflicts can occur either on a one-to-one basis or at much larger societal levels: in government, in business, in religion, in social contacts, and in the classroom.

Often in such cases, one party or the other attempts to enforce its own rhetorical style, or simply fails to understand the other party's. Of course, either can attempt to understand the other with the intention of adopting at least some of the other's rhetorical methods and of adapting at least some of their own rhetorical methods to those of the other, in order to bridge the gap, explain the difference between the two, and use that difference as a unifying element. But any teacher who has tried to explain Standard

American English rhetoric to Asian, Arab, or ghetto students, or who has attempted to understand these students, knows how difficult such a task can be.

The choices that people make, of course, will vary, and how people choose has very real ramifications, indicating the need for practical applications of intercultural, interlinguistic, international, and interphilosophic understanding and tolerance.

To understand these ramifications and applications, we can look at the history of the United States over the past five centuries, filled as it is with racism, challenges to religious freedom, interlinguistic animosity, and “gender wars.”

And this is the starting point for this essay: the conflicts which arise between cultures and languages, how these conflicts relate to politics and society, and ultimately how they influence our methods of education.

So I need to say at the beginning that this essay is about alienation. Specifically, it is about cultural, linguistic, and social alienation. It is about the alienation that occurs when one is not allowed to be one’s self, when one is made to feel unacceptable or inferior because one is different. It is specifically about the alienation that occurs when one is set aside, ostracized, or made an outsider because of one’s culture, language, or skin.

This essay takes a position sometimes politically correct; sometimes politically unpopular; sometimes in agreement with past writers, researchers, and autobiographers; sometimes at odds with these same people.

Mannes (1968) asks,

Who are you? You singly, not you together. When did you start – that long day's journey into self? When do you really begin to know what you believe and where you're going? When do you know that

you are unique – separate – alone? (reprinted in Hoopes, 1969, p. 3)

She suggests that each of us stands alone, separate from each and every other person. Yet Western – or at least U.S. – society does not necessarily view things in quite this way. While we speak of individuality, we are a society, in fact, built on conformity. While we speak of individual freedom and uniqueness, we as a society prefer people who fit the melting pot concept popularized by Roosevelt (1917): those who blend into the crowd. When we find someone who truly is unique – who thinks for one's self, who is culturally, linguistically, or philosophically different or who lives a different lifestyle – we don't honor that uniqueness; we push the person into isolation and are willing to accept her/him “back into the fold” only when s/he becomes like everyone else.

But Mannes (1968) offers a different perspective.

The time of discovery is different for everybody....I suggest that the first recognition comes when others try to tell you what you are. (reprinted in Hoopes, 1969, p. 3)

With this in mind, we need to enter this examination of cultural, linguistic, and personal alienation, specifically as it occurs in education, and what it does to the human identity and spirit.

My objective in addressing this hypothesis is multifaceted.

First, I conduct a threefold historical and literature review. This review begins with the dominance by conquering cultures through the annihilation of existing governments, religions, and languages and through the forced adoption of the conquerors' governments, religions,

and languages. It then proceeds to consider how the centuries-old debate over multilingualism and multiculturalism, capped by the Official English/English Only movement, has resulted in numerous laws directly relating to the governance of this continent and the education of both our children and our university students. Finally, it concludes with commentary and autobiographical material from several authors on how the bifurcation (defined below) of multiculturalism and multilingualism affects individuals' identities.

Next, by supplementing this research and autobiographical material with two original case studies, I add to the knowledge of how this can directly affect the education and lives of multilinguals in very different ways. In particular, I explore the identity issues which develop around the difference between the language and culture of the home and the language and culture of education. I define this difference not in terms of grammar and syntax or in terms of national and ethnic cultures, but in terms of uses, modes, and manners of communication, as well as the social/cultural identity implications of those uses, modes, and manners.

But this essay would be incomplete were it to conclude at such a point, since this debate must be seen in its larger historical context – touched upon in the historical and literature review, in the autobiographies, and in the case studies – when it is realized that English is not the original language of these continents and “middle-class”, white, male-dominated America is not the natural norm of society; Spanish was here prior to English (Castellanos, 1983), the indigenous tongues were here prior to either the modern European or the modern Asian tongues (as opposed to the ancient Asian antecedents of the indigenous languages), and non-whites and women have been driving forces on this planet and in the Americas for millennia.

Thus, I have had to approach this research with an understanding that we are not, in reality, looking simply at a question of cultural and linguistic coexistence between a host culture/language and one or more immigrant culture/languages, but rather at an extended history of conquering and dominance of “home” or “native” culture/languages by invading, outside, emigrating culture/languages. I show that this invasion and dominance has occurred not only in terms of intercultural, international, and inter-religious war, but also in the inference of governments and educational systems into the privacy of citizens’ homes and family lives.

Consideration of all the historical and prehistoric ramifications of this antithesis, however, would require several volumes. Therefore, for the purposes of this document, I follow from the case studies to a discussion and comparison of their results and implications for educational rhetoric and multilingual education.

I conclude this treatise with recommendations for further study, action, and social programming, particularly as relates to the inextricable elements of education and governance.

## The Problem

Concern about culture, debate over cultural purity vs. cultural pluralism (including animosity between religions and conflict between the sexes), and debate over multilingualism have swung between extremes for over 500 years on these two continents alone, ever since Columbus set foot on these shores (Zinn, 1980). The conflict over such issues is itself, however, much older than the Europeans' influence on what is now known as North and South America.

The central focus of the debate has been and continues to be whether immigrants' cultures and languages should be allowed to exist alongside the native culture and language of the "host" country to which the immigrants come, whether they should be subordinated or replaced by the "host" culture and language, or whether they should be allowed to dominate and replace the "native" culture and language. This question has been particularly debated in our public schools and in the academie.

## **The Context of the Research**

This central question is also the focus of the current document. My initial understanding in attempting to answer this question is that such a debate directly impacts governmental processes, business and social laws, and most importantly education. On the North American continent in particular, this impact has played out as religious domination by the Christian church and in terms of ongoing struggles between English and other European languages (French, Spanish, German, Italian, Russian, and Slavic variations), between English and Asian languages (Chinese, Japanese, and Korean), and between English and the languages spoken by the indigenous tribes of these continents and is exemplified by discussions over bilingual education in its many forms and in the Official English/English Only movement.



## Definition of Terms

In order to proceed with this discussion, a few terms need to be identified.

*Anomie* refers to “personal unrest, alienation, and uncertainty that comes from a lack of purpose or ideals” (Webster’s, 1985, 1988), in which might be included feelings of social uncertainty, dissatisfaction, and homelessness. It literally translates as “without norms” (Reeves, 1994).

*Bifurcation*, with which this paper is largely concerned, is the dividing of a topic, situation, philosophy, thing, society, or person into two separate, often opposing elements. In this study, bifurcation will refer to a person’s cultural background/social identity/existence and its affect on the individual’s functioning within society.

*Culture* refers here to a given person or group’s societal norms, practices, and structures. These include, but are not limited to, language, rhetoric, philosophy/religion, and hierarchies.

*Diglossia* is related to bifurcation and refers to the coexistence of two language systems within an individual’s reference frame. Generally, these language systems function at or near equal status, though at varying times and in varying circumstances, one or the other system will have preference, since each generally relates to specific, separate parts of the person’s life. It also needs to be understood, as pointed out by Kenji Hakuta, that bilingualism without diglossia, that is without two fully functioning language systems, ultimately leads to monolingualism, since the dominant or sole language system takes over. I show, through the course of this document, that diglossia is also directly tied to the coexistence of two cultural patterns within an individual’s frame of reference.

*Official English/English Only* refers to a movement favoring official language laws which would designate

English as the official language of U. S. American society, education, and government. At its deeper level, this movement would mandate English as the sole public, and in many cases private, language option. Often, Official English/English Only advocates promote the outlawing of all languages other than English.

*Pluralism* is the cultural extension of bifurcation and diglossia. It refers to the coexistence of multiple cultures, languages, and lifestyles within a single community, society, or nation.

*Polyglot* refers to a country's, society's, or individual's condition of being multilingual. Most often, multilingualism is accompanied by multiculturalism, and, thus, the condition of being polyglot is closely aligned with pluralism. For purposes of this paper, the term is used interchangeably for U.S. society and for individuals.

*Transitional bilingualism* refers to a type of bilingual education which serves strictly to move the learner from her/his native language to English, then to drop the use of the native language altogether.

# A History of Conquest and Subjugation

## The Long View Backwards

For people raised and programmed on the patriarchal religions of today, religions that affect us in even the most secular aspects of our society, perhaps there remains a lingering, almost innate memory of sacred shrines and temples tended by priestesses who served in the religion of the original supreme deity. (Stone, 1976, p. 1)

The same can be said equally in terms of racism and cultural and linguistic prejudice. We may have been reared – since we were in-utero – on a white, male-dominated, English-speaking, middle-class, pro-Christian, work-ethic paradigm; still we retain a “lingering, almost innate memory” of other traditions reaching backwards across millennia into northern Europe, Indo-Europe, Asia, Africa, and the indigenous beginnings of the American continents. How else could one explain the story (Funk, 1940) of Reidar T. Sherwin, a Norwegian immigrant to the United States, who recognized his own Norwegian tongue – pronunciations and meanings – in the place names and everyday words of the Algonquins?

Apparently, the conquest and subjugation of the American natives is not limited to the last five centuries; it reaches deep into European roots of conquest and domination which already were well established when the Vikings came here nearly one thousand years ago. Indeed, the Vikings came from a background of the male-dominated northern tribes of Europe conquering the priestess-run, goddess-centered cultures of central, southern, and western Europe and forcing their own culture, language, and religion on those they conquered.

And the Bible records the willful destruction of predecessor religions – including artifacts and literature – by the early Jews and Moslems (Stone, 1976). The battle for cultural and linguistic domination is a story reaching back at least seven to nine thousand years.

## **Multilingualism and Multiculturalism in the United States**

### **The First Four Hundred Years**

Is it any wonder then that the conflict and debate over cultural and linguistic plurality in this country began as soon as Columbus came to these shores (Zinn, 1980) and ultimately developed new dimensions? This debate has been continuous, often heated, and as divergent as the cultures and languages being addressed.

This has been a polyglot nation from the beginning (Castellanos, 1983; Crawford, 1992b). Columbus sailed primarily for his own personal financial enrichment and glory (Chomsky, 1993), but we need to note that he also was an Italian sailing on behalf of Spain. The first known immigrants – ancestors to those commonly called Native Americans – came across the Pacific land bridge from Asia (Castellanos, 1983) and perhaps on ships from a now-buried continent in the area we know as the South Pacific. And the first permanent European settlement on this continent – St. Augustine, Florida, founded in 1565 by Pedro Menendez de Aviles – remained Spanish for nearly 250 years (Castellanos, 1983), as the Spanish established themselves from (what is now) Chesapeake Bay to New Mexico long before the English (Castellanos, 1983; Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, 1542/1993). Indeed, even the French preceded the English (Castellanos, 1983; Núñez Cabeza de

Vaca, 1542/1993), whose first permanent colony was not established until 1607 at Jamestown, 115 years after Columbus's arrival. Twelve years later, the first black slaves were imported (Castellanos, 1983), bringing with them their own native languages.

But by then the indigenous tribes of these two continents were already being subjugated and decimated (Zinn, 1980). Already planted were the seeds of a nation divided over cultural, ethnic, and linguistic issues: a nation which was and is anything but equal and just for all.

The common belief is that this nation was founded on the principles of equality, that it was designed as a melting pot of peoples, where all could come to be free and live the life they chose. This belief, however, is immeasurably distant from the truth. Most of the founders of this country were white, male, Anglo (Roosevelt, 1917; Zinn, 1980), and elitist (Chomsky, 1993; Zinn, 1980).

An 1837 Pennsylvania law mandated school instruction to be given equally in German and English. Yet Benjamin Franklin openly complained in a 1753 letter to Peter Collinson, member of the British Parliament, about the growing presence and influence of Germans – later known as Pennsylvania Dutch – in Pennsylvania, observing that they imported books from Germany and that two of the six publishers in Pennsylvania were German and two were German/English. “Few of their children in the Country learn English....Signs in our streets have inscriptions in both languages, and in some places only German” (reprinted in Labaree, 1961, p. 234). He whined at interpreters being needed in the courts and speculated that Germans “will soon so out number [sic] us that all the advantages we have shall not, in My Opinion, be able to preserve our language” (reprinted in Labaree, 1961, p. 234).

I shall show later that linguistic, cultural, and racial complaints of this type were developed as tools for

controlling the masses. Apparently, though, the Continental Congress was otherwise motivated, despite Franklin's presence, since it printed numerous documents, including the Articles of Confederation, in both German and English (Crawford, 1992a). In fact, there was a point where a difference of only one vote would have made German the legislated official language of this country, rather than leaving English as the unlegislated presumed first language.

I have noted that the Spanish had established themselves on this continent long before the English. They also were taking a foothold in the central lands between the American continents and on the southern continent, and thus the framework for the battle over Spanish versus English, "Hispanic culture" versus "American culture," was being laid.

But we need to remember how that hold was established. The Spaniards readily conquered the indigenous peoples they met, killing those who resisted, taking some as slaves, and leaving the remaining ones under Spanish rule (Anzaldúa, 1987; Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, 1542/1993; Smith, 1776). (I later document Rodriguez's and Anzaldúa's references to this period.)

Chomsky (1993) aptly tells us:

The conquest of the New World set off two vast demographic catastrophes unparalleled in history: the virtual destruction of the indigenous population of the Western hemisphere, and the devastation of Africa as the slave trade rapidly expanded to serve the needs of the conquerors, and the continent itself was subjugated. Much of Asia too suffered. (p. 5)

But after the British defeat of the Spanish Armada and further Spanish losses at the hands of the French, Spain's influence in the world declined. The English rapidly became dominant in North America. And because of the many nationalities of Anglo America and the numerous

indigenous nations, multilingualism was necessary for trading, scouting, teaching, and preaching (Castellanos, 1983).

At such a point, those in power are likely to start looking for ways to control the masses, in an effort to retain their own power over those masses. The most logical way to do this is to divide the masses and turn them inward against each other. If the general populace can be divided into opposing subgroups – haves and have-nots, insiders and outsiders, elite or semi-elite and despised – those in authority positions can establish themselves as the stabilizers and peace-makers of society and thus maintain control over that society, which they probably believe is rightfully theirs in the first place. And the most vulnerable place to turn people against each other is on the social and economic plane, since most people look first to their own survival (even as Franklin did), measured most frequently in terms of social and economic success. But establishing such divisions is difficult to do when there exist no obvious differences between individuals and groups, on which to blame social and economic inequalities. Thus, those who would create such divisions must find obvious differences between people, and the most obvious differences on which to draw are the very visible differences of race and culture and the very audible differences of language.

But such differences are not natural dividers. Contrary to what some intellectuals would have us believe, it is the differences between people which draw us together. Humans naturally tend to be curious, to solve problems by seeking understanding of that which confuses and confounds them. This is why women and men naturally gravitate toward each other. The initial attraction is in differences, not in similarities. In social, business, and political affiliations, too, we seek those who complement us and fill in the gaps, not those who would duplicate us.

At the beginning, then, race and linguistics are not natural dividers, but natural attractors and uniters. Linguistic disharmony, as racial disharmony, is unnatural; it can be only manufactured and manipulated, never born or created.

The founding fathers of this nation new this fact and used it (Zinn, 1980). They followed the example of Europe by conquering and subjugating the native peoples of the world where-ever they went, for economic purposes, then blaming those natives – often subtly – for their own decimation by calling them racially inferior and morally lacking (Chomsky, 1993; Zinn, 1980). Smith (1776) demonstrated this thinking well. He wrote that the discovery of America had opened up a new market for European manufacturing and financial wealth, but decried the “savage injustice” of the Europeans rendered toward the indigenous peoples of the world. Yet even Smith, while impugning the Europeans, portrayed the indigenous tribes of the Americas, except those of Peru and Mexico, as “mere savages.”

Of course, those who were conquered – Indigenous tribes and imported Africans alike – did not speak English, Spanish, German, or Dutch, the primary languages of their conquerors and enslavers. This lack of a common language made it even harder to control people who not only were culturally different but who were beginning to find ways to resist the domination of their subjugators.

Can we wonder, then, that soon after Smith recorded his comments, J. Adams (1780) proposed an “American Academie for refining, improving, and ascertaining the English language” (C. E. Adams, 1852, p. 249)? He noted similar academies in France, Spain, and Italy, as well as the lack of such an institution in England. He saw English filling the void left by Latin’s exit as a world language, saying English speakers would “force their language into general use, in spite of obstacles that may be thrown in



their way” (C. E. Smith, 1852, p. 250), and felt this country should take the lead in that effort of force. He was rebuffed, however, by the Constitutional Convention, which viewed such schemes as elitist and intrusionist (Crawford, 1992b).

Noah Webster, too, expressed what he saw as a need for a monolingual standard (Crawford, 1992c).

Through all this, the voice of equal access and opportunity prevailed. In fact, California, officially bilingual for 30 years, published its first constitution in English and Spanish (Trasvina, 1988).

But matters ultimately would change. As English and German were being pushed on the northern continent, Spanish was being pushed on the southern continent, and other European tongues were coming across the Atlantic as well. With the growing rhetoric that a common language was required and that the native-speakers of the common language held economic, political, and social power, conflicts were bound to arise. With the indigenous tribes and the forced African imports effectively subjugated, those in power were bound to turn the people against the new immigrants of different tongues and cultures and, ultimately, against each other.

In the 1870s, the United States entered a period of exclusionary language sentiment and legislation. Following the 1876 election, Black Americans – who officially had been freed when a vacillating Abraham Lincoln was forced to sign the Emancipation Proclamation – came under the Jim Crow laws passed by several southern states. These included literacy requirements for voting and were applied to English-speaking Black Americans and non-English-speaking immigrants alike. Meanwhile, the Anti-Chinese Workingman’s Party got California’s second constitutional convention to ratify that state’s first English-only laws. This rhetorical maneuver effectively disenfranchised non-English-speaking Chinese from active participation in social affairs and education, and it was made even more

effective when the California Supreme Court subsequently denied Chinese the right to testify in court and Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, suspending Chinese immigration and barring foreign-born Chinese from becoming citizens (Trasvina, 1988).

Legal expert Leibowitz (1976) notes that American literacy tests, such as those of the Jim Crow laws, have continued to be enacted by states for purposes of deliberate ethnic, nationalistic discrimination: in Connecticut and Massachusetts against the Irish in the 1850s, in the South against Blacks after the Civil War, in California against Hispanics and Asians in 1892, in Wyoming against Finns in 1897, in Washington against Chinese at the state's founding in 1889, and in Alaska against Native Americans in 1926 (Leibowitz, 1984). In 1917, along with the creation of the "Asian Barred Zone," Congress legally mandated literacy for immigration in an effort to reduce immigration from eastern and southern Europe.

## The Early Twentieth Century

Roosevelt (1917), following on this theme, pulled metaphors from a 1906 play, *The Melting Pot*, to write:

We Americans are the children of the crucible....

The crucible must melt all who are cast in it; it must turn them out in one American mold...

All Americans of other race origin must act toward the countries from which their ancestors severally sprang as Washington and his associates in their day acted. Otherwise they are traitors to America....

We must have but one flag. We must also have but one language. That must be the language of the Declaration of Independence, of Washington's

Farewell address, of Lincoln's Gettysburg speech and second inaugural. We cannot tolerate any attempt to oppose or supplant the language and culture that has come down to us from the builders of this Republic with the language and culture of any European country. (reprinted in *Annals of America*, 1968, pp. 129-131)

Roosevelt, however, ignored the fact that this country's early European settlers and founding fathers had not "act[ed] toward the countries from which their ancestors severally sprang" by rejecting their old language, but had deliberately annihilated the language and culture which already were here, in favor of their ancestral language and culture. Roosevelt lied.

Later, the Anglo Conformity Movement and the anti-German sentiment of World War I inspired 20 midwestern states to bar schools from teaching German – once almost the official language of this country – while the Nebraska Act, in 1920, made English that state's official language, requiring English-only publication of state proceedings, as well as English-only instruction in all public, private, denominational (ignoring the separation of church and state), and parochial schools. The arguments for these laws were that a common language was needed and that children should not be confused by a second language (Trasvina, 1988).

The U.S. Supreme Court, however, found these laws to be violations of non-English-speaking people's constitutional rights. Robert Meyer, a parochial school teacher in Hamilton County, Nebraska, under a 1919 statute which mandated English-only instruction in all public and private schools and allowed foreign-language instruction only after successful completion of the eighth grade, had been found guilty of teaching the Bible in German. The Nebraska Supreme Court upheld this decision, but in the

1923 case of *Meyer v. Nebraska*, The U. S. Supreme Court nullified restrictive state language laws in Iowa, Nebraska, Ohio, South Dakota, and other states. Justice James C. McReynolds wrote for the Court, “The protection of the Constitution extends to all, to those who speak other languages as well as those born with English on the tongue” (excerpted in Crawford, 1992c, p. 237). A similar decision was delivered in the case of *Lau v. Nichols*, 51 years later, as recorded by Justice William O. Douglas.

It seems obvious that the Chinese-speaking minority receive fewer benefits than the English-speaking majority from respondents’ school system, which denies them a meaningful opportunity to participate in the education program – all earmarks of the discrimination banned by the Regulations. (excerpted in Crawford, 1992c, p. 253)

The court did not rule specifically for bilingual education since the plaintiffs made no such request. Nevertheless, the ruling was later used to justify various legislation aimed at promoting bilingual education, and the case stands as the major precedent regarding language minorities’ educational rights (Crawford, 1992c).

## **The 1960s to Today**

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 removed literacy requirements and ostensibly guaranteed Blacks the right to vote. Then in 1968, Congress enacted the Bilingual Education Act in an effort to meet the educational needs of non-English-speaking children, particularly Florida Hispanics. This is significant to note, since even today, failure to enforce attendance rules, punishment for speaking Spanish in school, and outright educational discrimination

are just some of the obstacles facing Hispanic youth (Crawford, 1992a).

In 1975, Congress concluded that Hispanics “have been denied equal educational opportunities by state and local governments resulting in severe disabilities and continuing illiteracy in the English language” and used the Voting Rights Act of 1975 to extend protection to Blacks, Indigenous Americans and Alaska Natives, and Asian Americans (Crawford, 1992a; Rodriguez, 1982).

Yet, this has not turned the tide of the Official English/English Only movement. In 1978, the Hawaii State Constitution was amended to make English and Hawaiian the official languages, but required Hawaiian for public acts and transactions “only as provided by law” (Crawford, 1992a).

In 1981, the Official English/English Only movement became official when Senator S. I. Hayakawa (R-CA) introduced the first modern Official English bill to Congress and founded U. S. English to support that legislation. Since then, bills have been introduced to every Congress by those who would amend the U.S. Constitution to make English the official language of the United States. In 1987 alone, five bills were introduced by Senators Jesse Helms (R-NC), Strom Thurmond (R-SC), Steven Symms (R-ID), Thad Cochran (R-MS), and Jake Garn (R-UT), along with Representatives Norman Shumway (R-CA), Clarence Miller (R-OH), William Broomfield (R-MI), and Virginia Smith (R-NE).

The bills all sought to make English-as-the-official-language the twenty-seventh amendment to the Constitution and to leave the implementation of that amendment up to Congress. Specifically, the Broomfield/Smith versions (H.J. Res. 13 and 60) would have barred state and federal governments from requiring the use of non-English languages in education, except when a student’s parental language was used in transitional

English instruction. This exemption did not, however, include foreign-language instruction or provide for use of non-English languages in school communications to students and parents (Crawford, 1992a).

Numerous states have passed Official English/English Only laws and constitutional amendments in the last decade (California 1986, Arkansas 1987, Arizona 1988, Colorado 1988, Florida 1988). Specifically, the 1987 Arkansas law states, "This section shall not prohibit the public schools from performing their duty to provide equal education opportunities to all children" (excerpted in Crawford, 1992c, p. 133). The 1988 Arizona constitutional vote prohibited all other languages from the ballot, public schools, and government functions, except to assist students who are not proficient in the English language, to the extent necessary to comply with federal law,...to provide as rapid as possible a transition to English; to comply with other federal laws;...foreign language as part of a required or voluntary curriculum; to protect public health or safety; to protect the rights of criminal defendants or victims of crime. (excerpted in Crawford, 1992c, p. 133)

This action was declared unconstitutional by a federal judge on February 6, 1990 (Crawford, 1992c).

These are only a few of the Official English/English Only laws which have been enacted.

On the other side of the coin, though, since 1987, 20 states, including Washington, have passed English Plus statutes. English Plus, conducted by the English Plus Information Clearinghouse (EPIC), is a movement which promotes an expanded network of facilities for comprehensive English language instruction, [fostering] multiple language skills among all...people, in order to promote our position in the world marketplace and to strengthen our conduct of foreign relations, [encouraging the] retention and development of a person's first language, [retaining and strengthening] the full range of language

assistance policies and programs, including bilingual assistance, [rejecting the] objectives and premises of English Only (English Plus Information Clearinghouse, 1987, brochure), defeating any and all Official English legislation and initiatives, and the exchange of information, public education, and advocacy towards English Plus policies (English Plus Information Clearinghouse, 1987, brochure). EPIC was founded in 1987 under the auspices of the National Immigration, Refugee, and Citizenship Forum and the Joint National Committee for Languages, and it is endorsed by over 50 civil rights and educational organizations, ranging from the ACLU and the Disciples of Christ to the Haitian American Anti-Defamation League to a number of state organizations nationwide.

## The Psychological Dilemma

Many educators, politicians, and cultural scientists, even within the non-native-English-speaking community, recommend total linguistic and cultural assimilation.

### Richard Rodriguez

Rodriguez (1982), for example, an Hispanic who was forced to assimilate in order to succeed, actively pushes for assimilation. He labels bilingual education “a scheme proposed in the late 1960s by Hispanic-American social activists” (p. 11), and he accurately defines it as “a program that seeks to permit non-English-speaking children, many from lower-class homes, to use their family language at school.” (p. 11). He claims that the loss of one’s personal, private, native language is necessary to gain social status. Then he steps over a line, with no apologies, where many dare not tread, and responds to the advocates of bilingual education:

I hear them and am forced to say no: It is not possible for a child – any child – to use his family’s language in school. Not to understand this is to misunderstand the public uses of schooling and to trivialize the nature of intimate life – a family’s “language”. (p. 12)

He declares that nobody can carry personal, private, home language into the public realm: that the home language, the language of personal communication, cannot be translated into an appropriate public language.

As I initially read Rodriguez’s remarks that no child could or should be allowed to transfer her/his first language into the classroom, it seemed obvious to me that a large



number of U.S. children – the English speakers – do exactly that. As I continued reading, however, I discovered that Rodriguez is not necessarily referring to a child's spoken language, though he wraps his arguments in that guise, but to the language of communication, regardless of its spoken or unspoken form. Rodriguez makes a major distinction between the motivations and manners by which families and intimates communicate, including but not limited to speech form, and the motivations and manners by which formal education systems operate in the name of communication.

But Rodriguez slips into sociocultural elitism when he, as the education systems, equates language – personal and private – with the parent “tongue” of an individual or group, equates the public language with English, rather than with a particular form and manner of communication – as he initially has intimated – and claims a need to relegate the home tongue, when it is not English, to a place of unacceptability, even in the home, rather than addressing the personal and private uses of language regardless of tongue. (Note the difference here between my use of “language” and my use of “tongue”.) He makes a very clear distinction between a family’s “intimate” language and the schools’ “public” language, then deliberately casts that difference as though it were a difference in tongues. But were this the case, then no English-speaking child could reasonably be allowed to speak her/his native tongue – English – in schools any more than a Spanish-, Chinese-, Japanese-, Finnish-, Russian-, or French-speaking child could reasonably be allowed to speak her/his native tongue. In casting this initially valid point in terms of tongues rather than usages, Rodriguez implies that those who speak English at home can indeed take their personal, private language into the public arena.

Rodriguez, like so many others arguing for total assimilation, starts with a very cogent and reasonable

argument and convolutes it into something quite different. In his case, Rodriguez begins with the question of private versus public languages – a rhetorical consideration – and convolutes it into a question of native versus public tongues – a sociolinguistic/psycholinguistic consideration. He turns a question of language usage and meaning into a question of grammars, lexicons, structures, and dialects, and, in the process, he hands power to a specific group of native speakers: those who speak English.

Rodriguez writes of the dichotomy of his language experience before entering school. He tells how he associated the low, soft, intimate tones of Mexican Spanish with his family and his home life; how he experienced Spanish, Español, as a private language – one that made him feel those who spoke it were related to him – and the higher-pitched, sharper sounds of English as a public language connected with los gringos. He never sensed Spanish as a public language, even in church or on the radio, like he did English.

From his writing, it becomes clear that as he entered school there was a profound sense of social class associated with each of the languages (Rodriguez, 1982, pp. 12-13). This led to a personal struggle between the two languages and resulted in English being difficult for him to learn. For the young Rodriguez, Spanish was a private, personal language rich with sounds of gentleness and emotion, while English was a public language used only in schools, supermarkets, and when otherwise “necessary”, harsh with sounds of tension and demand. Home and Spanish were a sanctuary from the rush and the strain of school, the marketplace, and English.

Adding to this conflict were the barrage of racial slurs during Rodriguez’s youth and his resulting awareness that his darker skin set him apart from los gringos. Rodriguez learned to associate Mexicans and their Spanish language with degradation, menial labor, and rejection.

Rodriguez would say, I think, that he suffered from profound anomie.

But what does this say for the English speaker? It says the English speaker has no private language. It says, if the Spanish speaker is denied a public language and must learn English, then the English speaker never had a private language and cannot gain one. Perhaps this suggests why Rodriguez later insists that it is necessary and right to force non-English-speaking children to give up their non-English language, even at home. By denying the non-English-speaker her/his private language and forcing her/him into the strictly public (by Rodriguez's apparent understanding) language of English, Rodriguez indicates we can make everyone the same, and thus equal. He observes, "Clearly it is not healthy to hear such sounds so often. It is not healthy to distinguish public words from private sounds so easily" (Rodriguez, 1982, p. 17). He draws on his own experience and claims that the constant difference between Spanish and English and between the respective cultures of those languages caused confusion and frustration. He says he used sound as an escape from the cultural and language conflicts. "I remained cloistered by sounds, timid and shy in public, too dependent on voices at home" (Rodriguez, 1982, p. 17).

But this denies something that Rodriguez himself intimates. Rodriguez compares the Español he heard at home with that he heard at church and on the radio, saying that the private language he heard was a ghetto Spanish. One begins to understand, even at this early stage, the main point Rodriguez makes (yet contradicts) throughout his book, that the marked difference between the private language of the home and the public language – at school, in the market, and at work – goes far beyond simple tongues; it is a matter of usage. This is what he suggests taking away from the non-English speaker, or even the non-standard-English speaker. But what of the native English

speaker? Doesn't the native-English-speaker also go home and speak a ghetto English? What Rodriguez does, in fact, is deny the non-English-speaker and the speaker of non-standard English what he permits, by default, the native English-speaker: one's private language alongside the public language. Rodriguez's plan may appear to make all equal, but it actually makes society more unequal by denying a large segment its basic humanity of a private home language.

Rodriguez (1982, 1995a) claims that the language confusion, though not the racial slander, began to end when the nuns from the school came to his house. They were there out of "concern" for "poor" Richard, who was having trouble keeping up in school. They wanted him to start speaking English exclusively, ostensibly for his own good, not only in school, but also at home. His parents complied.

He tells that, after his parents acquiesced, there was an immediate and growing shift away from the intimacy which had been such a part of family life. He writes of coming home one day to find his parents speaking Spanish in the kitchen, only to hear them immediately switch to struggled English when they saw him. When he ran to another room, he found his siblings speaking English. The private escape into Spanish was gone. He says the intimacy eventually returned in other ways, generally non-verbal, though never as profoundly as when soft, low Spanish had been the home language, and he holds that this shows intimacy is not dependent on a specific spoken language, but rather on people and circumstances, and I agree with him wholly. He further claims that, thus, the loss of the Spanish in his private life was no loss at all; on this I reserve judgment for the moment.

Rodriguez attributes his ease in American society, his professional success, to his overcoming of this bifurcation (a term he never uses), to his Anglicization. He thanks his own determination to succeed, the "need" to function in

English-speaking society, and obsessive reading and practice, for his ultimate scholarly and social success. He tells how on the day described above he determined to learn classroom English and how he soon after voluntarily volunteered to use English in school for the first time. He refers to his later extensive reading and “knowledge” gathering as a “scholarship boy” mentality, quoting Richard Hoggart, and defines this as being a student obsessed with achieving the perfection demanded (often subtly) by the teachers.

He also tells of losing his awareness of accents and of individual voices. In other words, he lost the sensitivity he says is unhealthy, but which any good teacher knows is essential.

He lost something else, too: his name. The teachers were so bent on English language and U.S. American culture as the only viable classroom options that they insisted on calling him Rich-heard instead of Ricardo, which was the name he knew himself by. He now refers to himself as Richard, because that is what others call him. But he has lost his identity, regardless of his own claims (1993, 1995a, 1995b) otherwise, and this is indicated by the loss he feels for the past, which he discusses later in the book (Rodriguez 1982, 1993). I resent such denial of a person's humanity, one's personal identity. Experience has shown me how many times I introduce myself as David and/or refer to myself as David, only to be addressed as Dave. That's not my name. That's not how I know myself. And I stand to correct anyone – even Rodriguez – who promotes such disrespect.

It's not that Rodriguez didn't gain anything. He says, “at last, seven years old, I came to believe what had been technically true since my birth! I was an American citizen” (Rodriguez, 1982, p. 22). He gained a sense of belonging in the community. But this was allowed to occur only at the loss of his sense – at least for a long while – of being an

intimate member of his family, a sense which he has never totally regained (Rodriguez 1982, 1993, 1995a). Only his sense of a racial and cultural identity was regained (Rodriguez, 1993). I shall show later, when I look at Anzaldúa's (1987) story, that this is not always the case, that it may not even be the case the majority of the time. And I shall show, when I examine the two original case studies, that there are yet further variations on this theme of identity and belonging; Rodriguez's experience is by no means the only, or even the majority one.

Rodriguez does distinguish between private individuality – that which he lost – and public individuality – that which he claims to have gained by being able to speak up in the public tongue, to blend with the crowd, and to have a public voice. Again, however, when we look at Anzaldúa's experience and at the two case studies, we will find other trends.

And it is in the comparison and contrast of these experiences and trends that we will move toward the final conclusions of this paper.

Rodriguez effectively reaches back to the melting-pot image perpetrated by Roosevelt (1917). But this is a convoluted form of the melting-pot mentality; it is not a melting pot at all. In a true melting pot, several distinct elements initially blend with each other into a semi-uniform mass. Conformity appears to occur naturally. But then, a curious thing happens. Some elements rise by their own lightness to the top; others, by nature of their heaviness, sink to the bottom. And in between can be found numerous layers of varying weight and density. Each naturally finds its own place, without being regulated, directed, or dictated by any other. Each takes a place in the whole, yet each remains distinct. What finally is formed is a continuous, consistently flowing, yet heterogeneous whole. What's more, each time a new element is added to the melting pot, it may at first appear to be lost in the mass of the whole, but

it eventually emerges as its own distinct layer, thus changing the overall construct of the molten mass.

But this is not the melting pot which is presented today or to which Roosevelt (1917) referred. That “melting pot” is an impossibility. It is one in which all the elements melt together and remain blended, ultimately taking the predetermined form of only one of those initially distinct elements. And each new element which is added is expected to conform exactly to the pre-existing mass. In terms of the metaphor, this is called assimilation; in terms of cultures, religions, lifestyles, languages, and philosophies, it means assimilation of each new element into the preselected culture, religion, lifestyle, language, or philosophy. No longer does the melting-pot image refer to a natural blending, yet distinguishing of elements, but to a very unnatural annihilation of all elements except one self-appointed as the whole. Such an unnatural melting pot cannot exist; it eventually will explode.

This approach in no way resembles the true melting-pot image, where each element has its own power and serves a unique place in the whole. This approach resembles a theory of dominance and subjugation, so familiar to the peoples of this continent, its southern neighbor, and Africa during the past five centuries, to the peoples of Europe and Asia long before that, and to women over the last seven to nine thousand years.

These issues and arguments present a confusion between rhetoric and linguistics. Rhetoric – as I have said – is the use of both verbal and nonverbal communication to persuade, or as Purves (1988) states, “the choice of linguistic and structural aspects of discourse – chosen to produce an effect on an audience” (p. 9). Rhetoric is the choice, the usage, not the linguistic and structural aspects themselves, not the grammars and lexicons.

What's more, Rodriguez is either grossly uninformed – which seems highly unlikely for one so well-educated and

book-read – or a liar. Bilingual education is not “a scheme proposed in the 1960s by Hispanic-American social activists.” As we have seen, bilingual education has been alive in this country at least since students were being taught in both German and English in the schools of Pennsylvania before the American revolution and later in the schools of Minnesota. Rodriguez appears to be deliberately misrepresenting the facts of history, then using his misrepresentations as grounds for his rhetoric against bilingual education. Some of my colleagues suggest that Rodriguez’s greatest dilemma is that he is not politically correct, but that one can still understand his position considering the pain he experienced growing up bilingual. But I say that Rodriguez’s greatest dilemma is that he presents a very real picture of the pain and crisis of identity which can occur in the bilingual – of his own pain – but distorts historical reality.

Rodriguez uses his fallacies to mislead his reader. Adding insult to injury, he establishes a false class distinction – just like the founding fathers of this country – by labeling non-English-speaking children as “many from lowerclass homes.” There are as many English-speaking children from “lower-class” homes, and many of the non-English-speaking children are recent immigrants from “middle” and “upper-class” families. Rodriguez seems to deliberately mislead his reader with half-truths.

I will give Rodriguez this. He makes it relatively clear at the beginning story that he is telling only his own experience. He intimates that others’ experience may not be his.

But then he makes his book, based on one man’s unique experience, an argument for denying all non-English-speaking students – increasingly the majority in this country of immigrants – the use of their first language, even in their private lives. He writes with a duplicit pen that one suspects is tainted by his own social climbing, much as



the founding fathers, themselves immigrants and children of immigrants, were tainted by their own power lust and economic climbing.

Nonetheless, it is the convoluted image of the melting pot that we see playing out in this country throughout the course of this century.

## **Those Who Agree with Rodriguez**

Before moving to Anzaldúa and the case studies, I have to emphasize that Rodriguez is not alone in his view. His position is also the position of the Official English/English Only movement. The late Sen. S. I. Hayakawa, founder of U. S. English, wrote in 1985,

What is it that has made a society out of the hodgepodge of nationalities, races, and colors represented in the immigrant hordes that people our nation? It is language, of course, that has made community among all these elements possible. It is with a common language that we have dissolved distrust and fear. It is with language that we have drawn up the understandings and agreements and social contracts that make society possible. (excerpted in Crawford, 1992c, p. 94)

Hayakawa refers to the melting-pot image – the convoluted one promoted by Roosevelt – then makes an additional suggestion that bilingual education is actually directed toward isolating non-native-English-speakers.

Sensitive as Americans have been to racism...no one seems to have noticed the profound racism expressed in the amendment that created the bilingual ballot. Brown people...red people...and

yellow people...are assumed not to be smart enough to learn English. No provision is made, however, for non-English-speaking French Canadians...or for the Hebrew-speaking Hasidic Jews...who are white and are presumed to be able to learn English without difficulty. (excerpted in Crawford, 1992c, p. 96)

Hayakawa apparently had not read this county's history, or he chose to ignore it. I already have mentioned some of the legislation against non-English-speaking whites, and these are only part of a trend (Zinn 1980, Chomsky 1993).

An editorial in the San Francisco Examiner of October 24, 1986 picks up on Hayakawa's sentiments, stating that people who want to succeed need to learn the common language, quickly and thoroughly. It is a message of practicality, not of ethnicity....[T]he citizen who does not become proficient in English is lost in the competition for high achievement in this state. (excerpted in Crawford, 1992c, p. 136)

And Senator Walter Huddleston (D-KY), ignoring history as thoroughly as Rodriguez and Hayakawa, said in Congress on September 21, 1983

The previously unquestioned acceptance of this language by immigrants from every linguistic and cultural background has enabled us to come together as one people...But in the last fifteen years, we have experienced growing resistance to the acceptance of our historic language, an antagonistic questioning of the melting pot philosophy...Bilingual education has gradually lost its role as a transitional way of teaching English...They and their parents are given false hopes that their cultural traditions can be fully

maintained in this country... (excerpted in Crawford, 1992c, pp. 114-115)

I say that Huddleston, too, ignores history, because the early settlers and founding fathers indeed proved that “their cultural traditions can be fully maintained in this country” when they forced their own language and customs on the Native Americans and on the imported African slaves.

Those who support a *lingua franca*, a common language, for education are at least on the right track; they understand the need for a common meeting ground. However, it is questionable whether monolingualism is that common ground. (I will discuss later the fine line between having a common language for education and making this country monolingual.)

Unfortunately, unification through a common language is not the only issue here. This is not the true goal of the monolingualists. As well-meaning as Rodriguez may be personally, and although some of the Official English/English Only advocates demonstrate the unifying power of a common language in education, both Rodriguez and the Official English/English Only advocates ultimately promote the mandating of the exclusive use of English in all public and private functioning. Most of the Official English movement’s stances, including those put forth by U. S. English and the late Hayakawa, are sounded from half-truths and misrepresentations. Ultimately, the goal of the leaders of this movement is not unification and enfranchisement, but conformity, along with discrimination against those who are different or think for themselves.

We already have seen the conformist tendencies of Huddleston's remarks.

U. S. English activists often point to Hayakawa’s immigrant status, implying that as a transplanted Asian-American, he understood the position of his racial siblings. But Hayakawa was an English-speaking immigrant from

Canada and his concerns about linguistic conformity were always, at some point, directed against Hispanics.

We see this same tendency also in a March 28, 1983 column by Guy Wright of the San Francisco Examiner.

The resistance comes from leaders of ethnic blocs, mostly Hispanic, who reject the melting-pot concept, resist assimilation as a betrayal of their ancestral culture, and demand government funding to maintain their ethnic institutions....This anti-assimilation movement...comes at a time when the United States is receiving the largest wave of immigration in history. This influx strains our facilities for assimilation and provides fertile ground for those who would like to turn language minorities into permanent power blocs. (excerpted in Crawford, 1992c, p. 128)

U. S. English has circulated a partial reprint of this column as part of its direct-mail fundraising campaign. But in so doing, that organization has deleted two key passages from the original (Crawford, 1992a). The direct-mail material reports Hayakawa as U. S. English's founder and honorary chairperson and quotes the above passage. The following paragraph, however, in the original column but not in the U. S. English version, clearly identifies the attitudes of the organization's actual chairperson, John Tanton:

Chairman is Dr. John Tanton, a Michigan physician whose years of concern about population trends and immigration – he founded the Federation for American Immigration Reform – led him to embrace this kindred cause. “With an organizational structure in place, we may at last be able to gain

some ground.” (excerpted in Crawford, 1992c, p. 128)

The other missing passage, towards the end of the column, states the fourth objective of the movement. The first three stated goals – included in the reprint – are to 1) adopt an Official English constitutional amendment at the federal level, 2) repeal laws mandating multilingual election materials, and 3) restrict government funding for bilingual education strictly to short-term transitional programs. The fourth goal reads, “Control immigration so that it does not reinforce trends toward language segregation.”

Additionally, U. S. English’s basic fundraising publication (U. S. English, 1984) from 1984 to 1988 stated:

English is a world language....Historic forces made English the language of all Americans, though nothing in our laws designated it the official language of the nation....English is under attack, and we must take affirmative steps to guarantee that it continues to be our common heritage.

This is the real agenda of the Official English movement.

The historic forces referred to, as I have shown, were forces of oppression, discrimination policies, and the use of socio-psychological ethnic blinders by most of this nation's leaders over the last 500 years (Chomsky, 1993; Zinn, 1980), and these policies continue (Chomsky, 1993)

Rodriguez (1982), too, contradicts himself. After speaking of being cloistered by sounds (quoted above), he goes on in his very next sentence to say:

And yet it needs to be emphasized: I was an extremely happy child at home. I remember many

nights when my father would come back from work, and I'd hear him call out to my mother in Spanish, sounding relieved. In Spanish, he'd sound light and free notes he never could manage in English. Some nights I'd jump up just at hearing his voice. (p. 17)

## **The Results of Assimilation**

So the question arises, why is it so unhealthy to hear the distinction of sounds, to understand the difference between private, intimate communication and public, forced verbiage? Rodriguez never answers this question. He does, as noted earlier, attempt to use the non-language-oriented nature of intimate communication as an argument against bilingualism. He fails to acknowledge, however, the personal and interpersonal damage done by the intermediate forced move away from intimacy. Even in pointing out that intimacy was found in other ways, he betrays its denigration, perhaps by circumstance rather than by consequence of language, and such denigration never is justifiable in human relations.

What comes through Rodriguez's writing very strongly is the joy of his childhood before his language came into question, as opposed to the loss of forced monolingualization. When he was bifurcated, stuck between two cultures and two tongues, he still had a sense of home. He did not, in fact, suffer from anomie, even though I have noted he might claim such suffering. Once he lost that bifurcation, that diglossia, through forced replacement of English for Spanish, he became obsessively practical, placing efficiency and societally-recognized success above his humanity and his family's.

Such confusion, played out as it is in our schools, courts, businesses, and sociopolitical systems, puts the non-

English speaker, the non-Christian, the non-white, and ultimately one gender or the other at such a sociological disadvantage as to demand a psychological price as well.

While I disagree with Rodriguez's conclusions and solutions, I find his description of the psychological effects of social isolation – discussed below – to be quite poignant and relevant.

But the sociological ends of the convoluted melting-pot approach are distinctly classist, with a dominant-versus-subjugated theme, and this can have profound psychological effects on those who are isolated, either by subjugation or by the mandate to remain “on top” as members of the “ruling class.”

Nowhere is this more obvious than in our classrooms, particularly in our composition and speech classrooms, where only American rhetorical forms are promoted and accepted, non-American rhetorical forms go unrecognized, the similarities and differences of these various forms remain primarily unutilized as teaching tools, and when the bridge-building between rhetorics breaks down, teachers, parents, administrators, and politicians blame linguistics – grammars, tongues, structures, gendered language, and non-standard dialects – rather than their own rhetorical failures. Thus, we end up at a debate over multilingualism, rather than at a consideration of comparative rhetoric as a teaching focus. Sooner or later, the voice of the Official English/English Only movement is heard ringing through academia and government, and the voice of comparative, interactive rhetoric – the building block of mutual understanding and cooperation – is drowned in the clamorous flood.

Such pushes for uniformity can only lead to isolation on a much larger scale than even Rodriguez portrays.

First, our schools will become elitist bastions where students either conform or are pushed out. In such a case, both groups of students are isolated from each other.

Second, those who conform and assume the accepted leadership roles of society – to which such conformity leads – will find themselves isolated from an increasingly international, intercultural, interlinguistic, interdependent world which they cannot understand because they have learned to not hear other voices. Finally, this isolation of the leaders ultimately becomes isolation of the nation from world society.

And when such isolation of the nation occurs, there is only one place left to turn: inward. When there is no contact with the outside world, one turns in on one's self. With a uniform, conformed nation, this might seem a very comfortable solution, but human nature does not work this way. Even within conformity, people are still feeling, thinking individuals who dream of possibilities not realized. When diversity lacks, people ultimately seek it, either by distinguishing themselves or by pointing to differences in others. When this happens, conformity breaks down, and when conformity breaks down, people draw increasingly further apart until they discover that it is their differences which unite them, which give each incomplete individual something to draw on in another. Then, perhaps, they realize that in recognizing differences, in viewing their different rhetorics and languages as distinct parts of a heterogeneous whole, they can build a complete unit with all its parts naturally finding their respective places.

And it is at this point that we wind up back at the two people standing face-to-face, one being direct, the other being suggestive and abstract. They might blame their failure to communicate on differing languages or tongues. Or they might recognize differing cultural and rhetorical backgrounds which can complement and enhance each other. Then they might reach out and attempt to understand each other's modes and usage, thus laying the structure for necessary bridge building.



This is what the question of multilingualism, multiculturalism, and comparative rhetoric ultimately boils down to. And in the end, the choice is ours – everyone – and the greatest responsibility lies with the teachers in the classrooms.

### **Gloria Anzaldúa's Story – A Different View**

Bifurcation is not necessarily solved by such forced substitution of one language for another, nor does the maintenance of multilingualism necessarily result in sociocultural or economic isolation.

Anzaldúa (1987) shows us this. Her story bears marked similarities to Rodriguez's. Early in her comments on multilingualism she writes:

I remember being caught speaking Spanish at recess – that was good for three licks on the knuckles with a sharp ruler. I remember being sent to the corner of the classroom for “talking back” to the Anglo teacher when all I was trying to do was tell her how to pronounce my name. “If you want to be American, speak ‘American’. If you don’t like it, go back to Mexico where you belong.” (p. 53)

She tells how her mother was “mortified” that she spoke English like a Mexican and how all Chicano students at Pan American University were required to take two speech classes for the purpose of eliminating their accents. But then she astutely observes:

Attacks on one's form of expression with intent to censor are a violation of the First Amendment. El Anglo con cara de inocente nos arranco' la lengua.

Wild tongues can't be tamed, they can only be cut out. (p. 54)

And here the similarity with Rodriguez ends.

Anzaldúa tells of other Chicanos accusing her of speaking the oppressor's language when she speaks English and of non-Chicano Latinas and Latinos considering Chicano as a deficient, mutilated Spanish. Then she says:

But Chicano Spanish is a border language which developed naturally. Change, evolución, enriquecimiento de palabras nuevas por invención o adopción have created variants of Chicano Spanish, un nuevo lenguaje. Un lenguaje que corresponde a un modo de vivir. Chicano Spanish is not incorrect, it is a living language....There is no one Chicano language just as there is no one Chicano experience. A monolingual Chicana whose first language is English or Spanish is just as much a Chicana as one who speaks several variants of Spanish. (Anzaldúa, 1987, pp. 55, 58-59)

Anzaldúa grew up in the borderlands of Texas: a land which was once part of Mexico but which – by Anzaldúa's telling and others' – was, over time and through numerous political and militaristic maneuvers, populated, settled, and developed, by various "Indian" tribes, ultimately being conquered by the Aztecs, then accosted, stolen, and subjugated by the U.S. government and the Anglos to the north (Anzaldúa, 1987; Chavez, 1984; Chomsky, 1993; De Leon, 1983). – Rodriguez claims (1993, 1995a, 1995b) that the Indians in fact seduced the Spanish with open arms and have in the end swallowed the would-be conqueror, language and culture, whole. – She grew up in a culture which is originally – and primarily racially – "Indian" but which has had intermingling of Spanish, Anglo, and Black

African blood, language, and culture. For the people of this area, multilingualism is a natural state of being. (And if we think about it, multilingualism is a natural state of being for every non-native-Standard-American-English-speaker in the U. S. today: increasingly the majority of the population.) Chicano Spanish, a language which Rodriguez probably would call “ghetto Spanish,” is a multilinguistic tongue by nature, and it shows the potential of multilingualism in the United States.

For a people who are neither Spanish nor live in a country in which Spanish is the first language; for a people who live in a country in which English is the reigning tongue but who are not Anglo; for a people who cannot entirely identify with either standard (formal, Castilian) Spanish nor standard English, what recourse is left to them but to create their own language?...a language with terms that are neither español ni ingles, but both. We speak a patois, a forked tongue, a variation of two languages....And because we are a complex, heterogeneous people, we speak many languages. Some of the languages we speak are:

1. Standard English
2. Working class and slang English
3. Standard Spanish
4. Standard Mexican Spanish
5. North Mexican Spanish dialect
6. Chicano Spanish (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California have regional variations)
7. Tex-Mex
8. Pachuco (called caló) (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 55).

Anzaldúa refers to 4 through 7 as her “home” tongues, with a preference for the naturally multilingual Chicano Spanish and for Tex-Mex, but she uses all of the above tongues.

After an extensive history of the mingling of so many languages in the area where she grew up, she writes about what she calls “linguistic terrorism.”

Chicanas who grew up speaking Chicano Spanish have internalized the belief that we speak poor Spanish. It is illegitimate, a bastard language. And because we internalize how our language has been used against us by the dominant culture, we use our language differences against each other. (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 58)

She describes the class distinctions among various Chicanos and Latinos, and she tells how Chicana feminists will avoid speaking with each other, particularly when tongues are involved, because to get close to another is to expose one’s own “shame.” And she tells of the censure and fear of censure that flows among the speakers of different Spanish tongues in this all-but-officially-Anglo country where any form of Spanish is considered undesirable.

*If a person, Chicana or Latina, has a low estimation of my native tongue, she also has a low estimation of me. Often with mexicanas y latinas we’ll speak English as a neutral language. (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 58)*

In telling the story of her youth, much as Rodriguez (1982) does, Anzaldúa reveals a much richer experience of mixed languages and music than Rodriguez ever would consider, although, as he has gotten older, Rodriguez

admittedly has given more credence to what he perceives as the Mexican experience (Rodriguez, 1993). And Anzaldúa does admit:

Chicanos and other people of color suffer economically for not acculturating. This voluntary (yet forced) alienation makes for psychological conflict, a kind of dual identity – we don't identify with the Anglo-American cultural values and we don't totally identify with the Mexican cultural values. (p. 59)

Anzaldúa writes of resenting the music, the food, the art,, the culture of her borderlands youth.

But notice how she then turns and mixes the languages in her writing. She tells us at the beginning of her story that she is going to do this, that she will not necessarily provide translations, and that she makes no apologies. She reminds me of the classical scholars of Europe who readily switched into Greek and Latin without any warning, translations, or apologies. She reminds me of John Donne, who did exactly the same thing in his sermons in the Anglican Church of four hundred years ago. It is in such bifurcation that Anzaldúa, quite unlike Rodriguez, finds her true identity.

When not coping out, when we know we are more than nothing, we call ourselves Mexican, referring to race and ancestry; mestizo when affirming both our Indian and Spanish (but we hardly ever own our Black ancestry); Chicano when referring to a politically aware people born and/or raised in the U.S.; Raza when referring to Chicanos; tejanos when we are Chicanos from Texas. (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 63)

In the end, Anzaldúa claims multiculturalism as her culture, multilingualism as her language, and bifurcation, that standing with feet in multiple existences, as her natural life, her life of choice, and the most appropriate life for her people.

Chicanos did not know we were a people until 1965 when Cesar Chavez and the farm workers united and *I Am Joaquin* was published and la Raza Unida party was formed in Texas. With that recognition, we became a distinct people. Something momentous happened to the Chicano soul – we became aware of our reality and acquired a name and a language (Chicano Spanish) that reflected that reality. Now that we had a name, some of the fragmented pieces began to fall together – who we were, what we were, how we had evolved. We began to get glimpses of what we might eventually become. (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 63)

Of course, Rodriguez would deny that anything such as the Chicano people can exist, except as a flaw in the American culture. He points out (1995a, 1995b) that Hispanic is not a race, as one might believe after reading most job applications. Most assimilationists would agree with him. And as I show in the first case study below, even those who oppose assimilation sometimes find the Chicano experience alien. But Anzaldúa defiantly stands fast in her conviction.

So, if you want to really hurt me, talk badly about my language. Ethnic identity is twin skin to linguistic identity – I am my language. Until I can take pride in my language, I cannot take pride in myself. Until I can accept as legitimate Chicano Texas Spanish, Tex-Mex and all the other languages

I speak, I cannot accept the legitimacy of myself. Until I am free to write bilingually and to switch codes without having always to translate, while I still have to speak English or Spanish when I would rather speak Spanglish, and as long as I have to accommodate the English speakers rather than having them accommodate me, my tongue will be illegitimate.

I will no longer be made to feel ashamed of existing [even as Rodriguez was as a child]. I will have my voice: Indian, Spanish, white. I will have my serpent's tongue – my woman's voice, my sexual voice, my poet's voice. I will overcome the tradition of silence. (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 59)

And Anzaldúa lays an even greater claim on the future, not only for her own people, but for all who would cling to their multilingualism.

Los Chicanos, how patient we seem, how very patient...When other races have given up their tongue, we've kept ours. We ...count the days the weeks the years the centuries the eons until the white laws and commerce and customs will rot in the deserts they've created, lie bleached. Humildes yet proud, quietos yet wild, nosotros los mexicanos-Chicanos ...Stubborn, persevering, impenetrable as stone, yet possessing a malleability that renders us unbreakable, we the mestiza and mestizos, will remain (Anzaldúa, 1987, pp. 63-64)

I shall return to this conviction in the concluding discussion at the end of this document. I shall show how Rodriguez, who largely denies his loss, has nonetheless begun to acquiesce, at least in terms of his former hard-line rhetorical tone, and begins to reflect what Anzaldúa openly

declares. And I will return to this malleability that Rodriguez (1982, 1993, 1995a, 1995b) claims to represent, but which only Anzaldúa and those like her, including the subjects of the two case studies below, truly possess.



## Two New Case Studies

But it would be far too easy to make conclusions simply on the personal accounts of well-published authors. (Though only Anzaldúa's 1987 book is referenced here, she is, in fact, a highly published poet, feminist, and lesbian activist.) As educators, we must be aware of the everyday experiences of our own students and colleagues. We must look beyond a few well-documented anecdotes and begin looking for patterns among those who live bilingually in our classrooms every day.

## Method

Thus, in the winter and spring of 1994, I conducted two case study interviews with bilinguals studying at the university level at that time. The first was with Celia (Appendix A), at that time twenty-eight years old, who was working on her thesis in ESL instruction while teaching Spanish at Eastern Washington University (EWU). The second was with Leonore (Appendix B), a twenty-three-year-old senior studying social work and sociology.

My objective was to discover the educational experiences and identity issues of two very different bilingual adult students who had grown up fully bilingual in monolingual school systems.

## The Subjects

I chose my subjects partly out of accessibility, but primarily because of their extremely disparate educational and language experiences. Celia was 28 years old at the time of the interview. She spoke English fluently but with a noticeable Spanish accent, even though she grew up in a

primarily English-speaking community, and she claimed that her Spanish carried a corresponding English accent. Leonore was 23 at the time of the interview. She, unlike Celia, was not noticeably bilingual. Had I not known her last name, I would not have realized she was Hispanic, and had she not openly discussed her bilingualism, one would not have known, since her English carries no Spanish accent and she claims her Spanish is equally void of any English accent.

## Celia

Celia describes the same sense of cultural, social, and linguistic bifurcation that we see in Rodriguez's and Anzaldúa's stories.

Her story begins much as Rodriguez's and carries a tone of experience similar to Anzaldúa's.

I grew up speaking Spanish first because that's what my parents...spoke....I didn't have any influence from English. When my brothers started going to school, that's when the English was introduced into the home.

Celia is the eighth-born of twelve siblings, so she always had some exposure to English. But, as she says, the "influence" of English was negligible until she personally entered school.

There is a notable reason for this fact: one which places Celia somewhat in a different experiential category from either Rodriguez or Anzaldúa. While both Rodriguez and Anzaldúa were asked to speak only English in school and Rodriguez was all but forced – by the schools – to speak only English at home, Celia's experience was virtually the opposite.

I think I spoke Spanish and English, but my mom and my dad were a big influence, and my mom forbade us, she just forbid us to speak English....She would punish us, even throughout high school....My mom still gets mad at us if we speak English.

I will discuss later Celia's reference to the "influence" of English and how this relates both to the cases discussed above and to our roles as teachers. First, though, we need to note that although English was not spoken in Celia's family home, it still played a major role in Celia's life, which echoes Rodriguez's experience.

I used to interpret for my parents, and I still do, because they understand English, and they can...It's very limited. They can speak it. But, you know, I would take them to the hospital, interpret, fill out forms.

I say this echoes Rodriguez's experience not because he interpreted for his parents – remember that English was forced into his home when he was very young – but because English became a transition point in Rodriguez's life, just as it later did in Celia's. Remember the confusion and alienation Rodriguez tells of experiencing when he walked into the kitchen and heard his parents speaking the old, familiar Spanish, only to hear them switch to halting English when they saw him there. He refers (1995b) to the day when the nuns – teachers at the Irish Catholic school he attended – appeared at the front door as the day when English violated his personal, private world. It was such a violation that Celia's mother sought to prevent.

And one might think that such an opposite approach would produce an equally opposite result. If Rodriguez felt confused and alienated by the forced conquest of Spanish

by English in his life, then one might expect Celia to experience a stability and continuity in not being forced to forfeit her language and her name (as both Rodriguez and Anzaldúa were expected to do).

But this was not the case. Because Celia's mother was so adamant about the Spanish, Celia shied away from Spanish, much the same way Rodriguez initially shied away from English when the nuns were so adamant and as both Rodriguez and Anzaldúa eventually moved away from Spanish (Rodriguez more permanently, Anzaldúa only in the rebelliousness of youth). Celia used English in school and with her friends, who by mere happenstance were primarily English-speaking, while she used Spanish only with her family and in church.

I kind of favored English, because I was able to express myself. I still think I'm able to express myself in English better than in Spanish....you know, in...when you speak a language for...I think I feel a lot comfortable speaking English. I do. I feel a lot more comfortable.

Remember that Anzaldúa writes of resenting the music and the language of her youth. Celia gives a possible explanation for such resistance to Spanish in her own life: an explanation which additionally suggests why Rodriguez initially resisted the English of his teachers.

And I guess, speaking Spanish with my parents, my mom would always, not be nit-picky, but you know...You tend to shy away, because you're going, "I don't really know how to speak Spanish," and you know, you just have insecurity....I was torn. I was torn between the two cultures, because I felt that being an Hispanic, I didn't really fit in with the majority....But I want to fit in like anyone else. So,

what I did is, you know, I tried, I was in the cheer leading squad. I was the only Mexicana. Everyone else was white. So, I wanted to fit in with everyone. And I didn't want to be known as...I didn't want to be different.

She says she ultimately felt a part of neither group. And where Rodriguez ultimately rejected his Mexican background in favor of the common culture, where Anzaldúa ultimately claimed bifurcation as her reality, Celia began struggling for her own balance between two existences. This change, her working out of the struggle, started in high school when she decided she “was being a hypocrite.”

[I] just one day, looked at myself, and I'm going, “Who am I kidding? I am not, I'm not gonna ever be, and I'm never gonna be like them. I'm gonna be, I'm a Mexicana, so I might as well just face it,” after that, so, and you know, and be proud of myself.

At that time, she started acknowledging and living her Hispanic heritage. She no longer denied her Mexican ancestry and, over time, went on to use her Spanish pronunciations of Spanish names and words even in the English-speaking public. She began mixing the two heritages within herself at all levels and within all contexts, even while maintaining a substantial degree of diglossia. She even began using Spanish pronunciations for Spanish names, such as Los Angeles and Mexico.

Nevertheless, she still struggles:

I still don't feel like I fit in. I mean, I go to the Chicano Education, where the Chicano Lounge...I don't feel like I fit in. I mean, when I would go to

Mexico, or if I would go to Mexico, I don't think they would accept me, because I'd be too Anglicized, or too Americanized, you know.

But the point is that Celia never was forced to give up her diglossia as Rodriguez was and as Anzaldúa was expected to but did not. To the contrary, her circumstances virtually forced her to maintain her diglossia. The English lingua franca of the schools, where she wanted to fit in, played against the familiar and expected Spanish of the home and church, where her heart already resided. This caused struggle for her; it still does. But it was only when Celia started making honest decisions about her own identity that this struggle began working itself out, in much the same way that Anzaldúa's own struggle has worked itself out over a greater length of time. Celia still is in that sorting out process, but she daily finds new aspects of herself and strengthens her self-identity. This is quite different from Rodriguez's involuntarily enforced monolingualism in his second language and his subsequent coping strategies. It is also different from Anzaldúa's defiance, although it is much closer to Anzaldúa's acceptance and use of her own bifurcation than it is to anything Rodriguez reports or supports. The differences here are clearly matters of expectations and acceptances, not of language or language competition.

This fact is underscored by Rodriguez's (1982, 1995a) confession that he still is singled out, both because of the high quality of his English and because of his skin color. Without fully admitting to what he demonstrates, Rodriguez shows that the question is not language but social/cultural attitudes. He offers monolingualism (most likely forced) as a remedy to social ills. He essentially takes the stance of "You can't beat them, so you have to join them." But along the way he inadvertently exhibits the reality that such a solution is simplistic and ultimately fails;

he makes it clear that even making the United States totally English-speaking culture, as Adams (1780) would have had done and as U. S. English promotes even now, will not eliminate the social/cultural bifurcation which exists in this country.

Celia, on the other hand, demonstrates that such bifurcation can be used for personal, social, and cultural growth and enrichment, even without the monolingualization of society. And this is illuminated by the light of Anzaldúa's fully accepted and manifested multiculturalism and multilingualism.

## Leonore

Leonore's experience is quite different from Celia's, or for that matter from Rodriguez's and Anzaldúa's, and it demonstrates how beneficial multilingual education can be. Whereas Celia grew up entirely in a single bilingual town which, nonetheless, was primarily English-speaking, Leonore had a varied experience which mandated multilingualism:

[W]e traveled a lot....I was born in California. And then, when I was about five, we moved to Germany, 'cause my dad was in the military. And so, I learned another language, which I forgot, though....[W]e lived there for about three years, and moved to Central America....El Salvador....We lived there for about a year. Then we moved to...California, again. And I guess, when I was really small, before I moved to Germany...we lived in Texas, in Corpus Christi, Texas. But, I don't remember that very much....And then, we ended up in Washington.

Leonore explains that her home situation was bilingual Spanish/English from the outset, due to a mixed-language ancestry.

My parents...both spoke Spanish. Their native language is Spanish....And my grandfather lives with us, too...up until I was in my sophomore year in high school...spoke to me mainly in English....He is my...real father's step-dad....And he was Russian...but he never spoke to us in Russian. He spoke to us in English.

Leonore mentions that her grandfather attended a Russian-language congregation on Sundays, meaning he retained his first language, while the rest of the family attended a Spanish-language congregation which met in the same building, where there also was an English-language congregation.

She also tells of being put straight into a German school in Germany and of having all her lessons in German.

When asked if she experienced any confusion or division (read bifurcation) over her multilingualism, she responds,

[I]t never caused any confusion at all, um, in any of the schools....[W]hen I went to Germany, I had to acquire a third language....[B]ecause I was in a German school, they just put me into a German school....And so, I had to learn German; I had to learn the language in order to do well in school. So, I guess I spoke it really well. My mom says I spoke it very fluently.

It was not until she returned to the United States, in her elementary school years, that a problem developed, and she makes it quite clear that this was not a problem with her



language or cultural identity – which were then and are now intact – but with the school system’s unwillingness to accept her language, specifically her third language, German.

And then, when I came back to the States, I remember that the teacher told my mom that I needed to forget...The teacher...There was a counselor, a teacher, and a principal that came to our house one day. And they said that it was causing problems for me at school, because I was forgetting words, and I was putting in German words or Spanish words in term of, when I was talking, I would forget a word, and if it couldn’t come out immediately, then I would stick a word from another language, the same word that I was looking for, but a different language. So, um, then my mom didn’t emphasize German anymore, because she used to speak to me in German, after...

Note that Leonore makes a case for learning the common language and using it in school, but not for eliminating one’s first language. She was required to function in German in the German school, so she had to learn the language, and she values this experience. In this regard, she sits right alongside Rodriguez. But the Germans did not require her to sacrifice either her native Spanish or her native English. Only when she returned to the U. S. did she have such an experience.

And when Leonore talks about her language use growing up, it becomes clear that even the American school system did not ask her to forfeit her Spanish at home, but only at school, and that it was only the third language, German, which she was asked to suspend.

Um, at home, it was mainly Spanish, unless I was speaking with my grandfather, which was English. And then, in school and around my community, it was English, just complete English....With my family – and it still is ‘til this day – if you go to my house, it’s Spanish. My church is Spanish. Everything I do is Spanish. But, when I’m at school, at work, everywhere else, it’s English. And it doesn’t cause any confusion. It’s just...that’s how you were raised. You know, it’s like, if you spoke to your dad in English, you’re not gonna go and speak to him in Spanish....It never seemed to me, you know, to think about it, why I know two languages. It just kind of was, like, natural. I mean, I didn’t see myself as being different from other kids, because...for all I knew, they could be speaking some, some other language, um, at home, too.

Leonore has gone beyond even what Anzaldúa relates in her story. While Anzaldúa tells of multilingualism being a natural state, still even she writes of resentments and struggles involved. But Leonore speaks of no such struggles and resentments, only of the richness of her experience. And Leonore speaks in less-than-complimentary terms of school systems which mandate the elimination of one's first language and of the specific system which asked her to forfeit her third language.

You know, and that was a big mistake, I think...Their mistake, because of the fact that I would be trilingual, and, you know, valued as three people, instead of only two, you know. I mean, because, you know, you’re, you’re...you’re valued...you’re not valued, but you are, you serve for two different cultures, type thing. You know,

you serve for the American culture, and you serve for the Spanish culture, 'cause you can communicate with both. And if I knew how to speak German as well still,...then I would have learned, learned and known it very well by this time, and I could have communicated with other people, like in a third culture. And, since...they told my family, my family didn't want me to be different. They didn't want me to...stick out like a sore thumb, or be retarded or anything in school, so...they stopped speaking to me in German.

## Answering the Multilingual Question

### Education

As I started into this study I was motivated by a major disagreement with Rodriguez's position of assimilation. As indicated above, I found Rodriguez elitist and arrogant. It seemed to me that he had chosen to sacrifice his native linguistic, then cultural, heritage, not so much out of a need to get along, to survive, but out of ambition to fit in and to take on the common language and culture in order to place himself equal to or above others around him.

It is only as I have dug deeper into his distinction between public and private language that I have begun to shift my position on bilingual education. I find Rodriguez's argument in favor of a public language (in this case, Standard American English) for public education extremely convincing. I still have felt, as mentioned above, that he fails to address the fact that native-English-speaking students could carry their private language into the marketplace. But when I had the opportunity to ask him about this (1995b) he responded that, while the public/private dichotomy is more easily understood by those whose first language is not the public English, even most native-English-speakers use a different vernacular and tone among intimates than is common in the public arena. Thus, everyone faces the assimilation question of to some degree adopting the public language of the schools. This fact is reflected in Celia's story and in Leonore's German experience.

But I have not come to the point of agreeing with Rodriguez that the nuns, his teachers, were justified in expecting him to relinquish his home language completely or that this is a necessary part of his or anybody else's public assimilation. Rodriguez is still somewhat of a hard-

liner, but, as I have noted, he has softened his rhetoric as he states, “I don’t know that I’m in favor of assimilation, any more than I’m in favor of the sunset, or any more than I’m in favor of breathing. Assimilation happens – to coin a phrase” (Postrel & Gilesspie, 1994, 1995a, 1995b). He is correct in this statement. But he also continues to contradict himself. While stating that public language is a fact of life and that assimilation is natural, he glosses over the fact that private, intimate language is also a fact of life and that one’s home identity is at least as, if not more, natural and important. He reflects this duplicit thinking not in his assertion that a common language of education is necessary or that students of all backgrounds should be expected to learn the common language – even as Leonore was expected to learn German – but in the fact that he then refers (1995b) to the public language violating his private world and implies that this is acceptable when the reverse is not.

And Anzaldúa, Celia, and Leonore, all three, demonstrate that it is possible to maintain one’s private and public identities – and, thus, languages – simultaneously. One’s private language – be it Spanish, Chinese, Jive, hill vernacular, or ghetto English – can continue to exist, even as one is learning and using the public language (in this case Standard American English) in school. And as long as one’s private language, one’s first language is kept intact, even as one is learning and using the public language in school, then the possibility remains that one will be able to use that first language in social and business forums as appropriate, while still having access to the public identity and freedom of the common language, which Rodriguez finds so vital.

Anzaldúa and Celia show that this may likely involve struggle, even as Rodriguez has emphasized, but they also demonstrate that such struggle can be directed into personal growth and self-discovery, and I have noted that

Rodriguez's struggle was not ended by his assimilation; it only took a different face.

Rodriguez (1982, 1993, 1995b) has gone on to relearn Spanish and use it professionally, but Anzaldúa and Celia prove that such relearning is not necessary. Though both were required to learn and use the common English in school (Anzaldúa by force, Celia by circumstance), both have maintained their first language and gone on to use it professionally (Anzaldúa as a writer, Celia as a Spanish teacher and English Second Language teacher with Hispanic students).

Leonore, meanwhile, confirms that such conflict of identity is not inherent. Even Anzaldúa's experience shows that the conflict is not inherent, since her experience is simply that of one clearly tenacious and sometimes rebellious individual.

What this says to us as educators is that we need to seriously reconsider the idea of bilingual education, even transitional bilingual education, or at least how we go about it. It may be that we indeed do need to educate via a *lingua franca*, in this case Standard American English.

But here we are talking about the public language. Let us not forget Rodriguez's lesson to us of the difference between public and private language. Let us not forget the violation of his world when the private language was ripped from his personal life by a myopic educational system. And let us not forget the lessons of Anzaldúa, Celia, and Leonore, which clearly show that private language, be it Spanish, Chicano Spanish, Chinese, Black English Vernacular, or Street Jive, can co-exist with the common tongue.

But Celia's case needs closer examination here, because her experience gives us the most extensive guidelines for the possible reformation of multilingual education.

Celia has struggled with the identity issues of walking in multiple worlds, multiple languages, multiple cultures.

She knows the Standard American English, the white middle-class American experience, and she can relate it to her students, native-English-speaker and native-Spanish-speaker alike. She also knows the soft, low, intimate sounds of Spanish, and the uniquely Hispanic culture that we see variously mirrored in both Rodriguez's and Anzaldúa's stories.

Thus, when a primarily Spanish-speaking student sits down in one of her English classes, she can speak to that student in Spanish, but she does not have to. In fact, it is preferable that she does not. What makes far greater sense is for her to draw upon her own knowledge of Spanish culture and language and compare that to the Anglo experience and language, in Standard American English, whenever she needs to break through any difficulty the Spanish-speaking student might have in learning either Standard American English or the social values on which it is based.

This approach accomplishes two objectives. First, it gives the student a reference point based in familiar circumstances and comparisons, from which to transfer understanding into the new culture and language. Secondly, it simultaneously teaches the student the common language, by direct experience and struggle, the same way that Leonore had to learn German, the same way that Rodriguez had to learn English, and the same way that Rodriguez later had to learn Spanish, which he had not used after the age of seven.

This approach is not a transitional bilingual education approach. It is very much a full immersion approach, such as I have found most helpful in refreshing my own German-language skills and in initially learning Tibetan. But it carries a difference founded in rhetoric. Rather than expecting the non-native-speaker of the language being learned, the target language, to be automatically able to transfer between two structurally different languages, it

gives rhetorical references from both cultures, from which the student can make such transfers. This is significant since rhetoric – the language use of a culture and the semantic functioning of that language – is far more closely related to the thinking of that culture than are the specific words. (Grammar falls somewhere in the middle and is a topic within itself.)

And I have seen this approach used highly effectively in classes I have attended. I have watched the instructor, familiar with Japanese and French, use examples of Japanese and French rhetoric and cultural thinking, not only to make the English easier for the international students to comprehend, but also as informative comparisons for native-English-speaking students who would be going on to teach international students, or already were. The same instructor has also occasionally referenced specific words in the non-English languages, but such occasions have been rare and seemed to import far less lasting effects on the students than did the rhetorical and cultural comparisons.

Such an approach means, of course, that we need immediately to start training our future teachers – particularly our future English Second Language teachers – in the art of intercultural and comparative rhetoric. This may mean that the cultural element of teacher training needs to be broadened to include a wider world view, or it may mean that world history needs to become an integral part of our English-teacher-training programs. But this is a small price to pay for being able to bridge the gaps, as I wrote of in the beginning of this essay, in an increasingly international society.

It also means that we need to put a far greater emphasis on foreign language learning among our would-be teachers. An understanding of a foreign language, as our international students' understanding of English, requires an understanding of the culture from which that language



derives, and such understanding is exactly what our teachers need to teach their international students. Combined with the cultural, historical element mentioned above, this makes a strong training package for future teachers.

## **Society and Government**

But while we are stressing comparative rhetoric and monolingual, common-language instruction in the classroom, we need to remember that we do not live in a monolingual society and are increasingly unlikely to. International business demands an awareness of other languages (an additional reason for foreign-language requirements). And not everyone who comes to this country will be a child in the public school systems or a university student. Some will be simply coming here as adults seeking the nebulous American dream of which we as a nation are so proud and which, Rodriguez (1993, 1995b) points out, we promote so heavily to the rest of the world. Some, too, are already in this country without knowing much if any English. This continuing influx of non-English-speaking citizens we have openly invited must be accommodated, as Anzaldúa indicates.

We still need to allow for interpreters in society. We still need to allow for translators. We still need to provide multilingual election ballots, legal forms, and courtroom situations. If we do not, then we risk rapidly returning to the very discrimination that the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled against in decisions such as those cited above.

## The Final Solution

So in the end, I am suggesting a balance: a balance between the common-language and comparative rhetoric in education, a balance between monolingual education and a multilingual society.

The best solution to the multilingual question is presented in 4Cs's (Conference on College Composition and Communication) (1988) National Language Policy and by the English Plus. English Plus has been discussed above. The 4Cs's National Language Policy calls English Only unnecessary, unrealistic, educationally unsound, unfair, dangerous, invasive, counterproductive, and unconstitutional. While in the end I have shown how I question the absoluteness of this evaluation, I still find the 4Cs's simple recommendations extremely cogent. They are 1) to provide resources to enable native and non-native speakers to achieve oral and literate competence in English, the language of wider communication [a position which specifically mandates neither English Only nor multilingual education], 2) to support programs that assert the legitimacy of native languages and dialects and ensure that proficiency in one's mother tongue will not be lost [a position which again does not mandate multilingual education, but does highly suggest foreign language instruction and support, and which does essentially mandate a multilingual society as outlined above], 3) to foster the teaching of languages other than English so that native speakers of English can rediscover the language of their heritage or learn a second language [and so that native-speakers of languages other than English can maintain and improve their native tongues].

This policy is essentially what Smitherman (1986) recommended when she proposed to 1) reinforce the language of wider communication; 2) promote and extend the legitimacy of mother tongue languages as dialects; and

3) promote the acquisition of one or more foreign languages, preferably those spoken in the Third World.

In other words, we can and should give students, both native-English-speakers and non-native, every opportunity to learn and use the common tongue, Standard American English. This means, in my opinion, teaching in English in all cases, but not without extensive use of comparative rhetoric and not without allowance for translation of individual words and concepts. These two devices give students an absolutely essential basis for understanding English, but do not leave them functioning strictly in their native tongues, as transitional bilingual education does in spite of itself. The translation of individual words and concepts, even to the point of asking students for their own interpretations of their native language and culture, legitimizes the students' background and thus strengthens students' self worth and identity. This, admittedly, is a middle ground between bilingual education as we now see it practiced in this country and the extreme monolingual approach which is promoted by Rodriguez and others. And the promotion of learning other language, particularly Third World languages, gives further legitimacy to all languages and all cultures other than English, thus reinforcing the legitimizing of students' backgrounds and identities.

This is a challenging approach. But it also is the most thorough and potentially reaches the most people with the least amount of struggle. It promotes dialogue, discussion, and intercultural understanding. And in an international, democratic society such as our own, this is as it should be.

## References

- Adams, C. F. (1852). The works of John Adams, 7, 249-51. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Adams, J. (1780, Sept. 5). A letter to the President of Congress. In C. F. Adams. (1852). The works of John Adams, 7, 249-51. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Annals of America, 14, 1916-1918, 129-31. (1968). Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). Borderlands/la frontera: The new Mestiza. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.
- Castellanos, D. (1983). A polyglot nation. The best of two worlds: Bilingual-bicultural education in the U.S. Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Education.
- Chavez, J. R. (1984). The lost land: The Chicano image of the southwest. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1993). Year 501: The Conquest Continues. Boston: South End Press.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. (1988, March 16) The national language policy of the conference on college composition and communication. (brochure)
- Crawford, J. (1992a). Hold Your Tongue. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Crawford, J. (1992b). Introduction. J. Crawford, ed. Language loyalties: A source book of the Official English controversy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Crawford, J. (Ed.). (1992c). Language loyalties: A source book of the Official English controversy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- De Leon, A. (1983). They called them greasers: Anglo attitudes toward Mexicans in Texas, 1821-1900. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- English Plus Information Clearinghouse. (1987). Policy statement. (brochure)
- Funk, C. E. (1940). Forward. In R. T. Sherwin. (1940). *The Viking and the Red Man: The old Norse origins of the Algonquin language*. New York: Funk & Wagnall's
- Labaree L. W. (Ed). (1961). *Papers*, 4, (234). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Leibowitz, A. (1976). Language and the law: The exercise of political power through official designation of language. In *Language and politics*, ed. W. M. O'Barr and J. F. O' Barr, 449-66. The Hague: Mouton.
- Leibowitz, A. (1984). The official character of the English language in the United States. *Aztlan*, 15, 25-70.
- Mannes, M. (1968). Who am I? Reprinted in Hoopes, N. E. ed. (1969). *Who am I: Essays on the alienated*. 3-10. New York: Dell Publishing.
- Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, A. (1993). *The account: Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca's Relación*. (M. A. Favata & J. B. Fernández, Trans.). Houston: Arte Publico Press. (Original work published 1542)
- Postrel, V. & Gilespie, N. (1994). On borders and belonging: A conversation with Richard Rodriguez. *Utne Reader* (68). Excerpted with permission from Reason (Aug./Sept. 1994).
- Purves. A. (1988). Introduction. *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric*. ed. by A. Purves. *Written communication annual: An international survey of research and theory*, 2. Ed. by C. R. Copper & S. Greenbaum. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Reeves, L. (1994, February). Class lecture at Eastern Washington University.
- Rodriguez R. (1982). *Hunger of memory: The education of Richard Rodriguez*. Boston: David R. Godine.
- Rodriguez R. (1993). *Days of obligation: An argument with my Mexican father*. New York: Viking.

- Rodriguez, R. (1995a, April 30). My America, Your America. Address delivered at the Northwest Regional Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Spokane, WA.
- Rodriguez, R. (1995b, May 1). Address delivered at Spokane Falls Community College, Spokane, WA.
- Roosevelt, T. (1917, September). Children of the crucible. In *Annals of America*, 14, 1916-1918, 129-31. (1968). Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica.
- San Francisco Examiner. (1986, October 24). Prop. 63 deserves approval.
- Smith, A. (1976). An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations. (R. H. Campbell, A. S. Steiner, and W. B. Todd, Eds.). Oxford: Clarendon Press. (Original work published 1776)
- Smitherman, G. (1986, March). Toward a national public policy on language. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, New Orleans, LA.
- Stone, M. (1976). When God was a woman. New York: Dial Press.
- Trasvina, J. (1988, April). Official English/English only: More than meets the eye. Washington D.C.: National Education Association of the United States.
- Webster's ninth new collegiate dictionary. (1985). Springfield, Massachusetts: Merriam-Webster.
- Zinn, H. (1980). A people's history of the United States. New York: HarperCollins

## Appendix A

Interview on Bilingualism  
conducted by  
David W. Trotter  
January 21, 1994

Subject: Celia

Age: 28

Education: At time of interview: Working on her Master's  
Thesis in ESL

D: Anyway...Why don't you tell me...You grew up bilingual, right?

C: Correct.

D: Now, did you grow up speaking both languages, or what was your background with the two languages.

C: I grew up speaking Spanish first, because that's what my parents...that's all they spoke. So I didn't have...I hadn't gone to school; I didn't have any influence from English. When my brothers started going to school, that's when the English was introduced into the home.

D: Your brother's older than you are?

C: Oh, I have...there's twelve of us.

D: Twelve. Where do you fall into the family?

C: I'm the eighth one.

D: Eight of twelve?

C: Yeah....So when they went to school..what you learn in school, you usually bring in. And that's how I was introduced to English.

D: So how old were you when they first started going to school?

C: I think my older...the oldest one, he's like 48.

D: He's 20 years older than you?

C: Yeah. So I think I was introduced...I don't remember, but I think I was introduced to, of course Spanish, but

- English came almost immediately...almost immediately.
- D: Because they were already in school?
- C: They were already speaking it.
- D: Where was this?
- C: This was in Othello.
- D: Oh, this was in Othello? You grew up in Washington?
- C: Yeah.
- D: But you grew up speaking Spanish at home. Did you ever speak Spanish...a...speak English outside the home, outside your home...Spanish or English outside the home until, before you went to school?
- C: Yeah. I think I spoke Spanish and English, but my mom and my dad were a big influence, and my mom forbade us, she just forbid us to speak English.
- D: Oh she did?
- C: Yeehh. She would punish us, even throughout high school.
- D: Even...No English at home?
- C: No English at...If she heard us...
- D: Even outside your home, huh?
- C: Well, outside, when she wasn't around, we could, because we were in school, and my mom figured, "Okay, you speak English all day. You need to put some time speaking Spanish"
- D: Okay.
- C: You know, so that's what we did.
- D: A curious question. Does your English, does your Spanish have an English, an Anglo-American-Anglo accent?
- C: My Spanish?
- D: Yes.
- C: I think it does.
- D: You think it does?
- C: I think it does. It does. If I were to go to Mexico, they could tell. They could tell that I'm...



D: Not a Native?...

C: No, I'm not a native from Mexico.

D: And a...The reason I ask that is because you do...Your English is accented.

C: Really?

D: Yeah...You don't hear that?

C: No, I don't. People tell me...Some people tell me that I do have an accent. I can't hear.

D: Okay.

C: Yeah.

D: Well that was why I was wondering, is what kind of a English-Spanish/Spanish-English background you have. So, how much have you used the languages since you grew up?

C: My Spanish?

D: Spanish and English both.

C: Uh. Well I use to interpret for my parents, and I still do, because they understand English, and they can...It's very limited. They can speak it. But, you know, I would take them to the hospital, interpret, fill out forms. So, yeah.

D: Did the rest of the family, the kids?...

C: They all did that.

D: So, and you still do that.

C: Yeah, we still do that.

D: You still do that?

C: Yeah.

D: When you go home, you speak...?

C: Spanish.

D: Spanish?

C: Mom still gets mad at us if we speak English...

D: If she hears the English coming out?

C: Yeah. Exactly.

D: In other words, she wants you to keep the language.

C: Yeah, well exactly. If you don't know where you came from, you don't know where you're going.

- D: Well, that brings up another set of questions...Is...You spoke Spanish at home, English at school, and if your mom was around anyplace else, you spoke Spanish?
- C: Yeah, unless I was interpreting or I was talking to one of my friends which were, usually they were...
- D: English speaking?...
- C: English speakers.
- D: What did that do for your concept of the languages? How did you view the two languages? Did you personally favor one or the other?
- C: Um, I kind of favored English, because I was able to express myself. I still think I'm able to express myself in English better than in Spanish.
- D: Why is that?
- C: I don't know. It's just I, I might have a limited vocabulary in Spanish.
- D: Why would you...Now, you spoke the Spanish longer?...
- C: Yeah, but you know, in...when you speak a language for...I think I feel a lot comfortable speaking English. I do. I feel a lot more comfortable. And I guess, speaking Spanish with my parents, my mom would always, not be nit-picky, but you know...You tend to shy away, because you're going, "I don't really know how to speak Spanish," and you know, you just have insecurity...
- D: She was correcting you?
- C: All the time.
- D: Like, so many people.
- C: Yeah. So you tend to shy away...
- D: That's not new to Spanish. The English do it, too, and uh...
- C: Yeah...
- D: ...get it in schools....Did you speak one language more than the other as you grew up?

- C: Uh...I think as I was growing up, I think English took over.
- D: It took over?
- C: Yeah, It took over, 'cause we speak...well, with my brothers and sisters, I would talk, you know, we would talk to each other in English.
- D: Oh really?
- C: So, the only time we would speak in Spanish was with Mom and Dad.
- D: Do you know, do you have any idea why you did that?
- C: I have no idea. I have no idea.
- D: Did you have any Spanish-speaking friends?
- C: No. I didn't. I, I...acquaintances, yeah, I mean, there was some, but I would mostly...
- D: 'Cause Othello has how much of a Spanish population?
- C: It's like almost 50 per cent, almost 50 per cent.
- D: That's what I thought.
- C: But, back then it was a little bit...It was fewer...
- D: Fewer?
- C: Fewer back then.
- D: So, real strong English-speaking within the community?...
- C: Yeah. Yeah. Exactly.
- D: How did that make you feel about the two cultures?
- C: I had a...I was torn. I was torn between the two cultures, because I felt that being an Hispanic, I didn't really fit in with the majority. And being an Hispanic I didn't feel...I still don't feel like I fit in. I mean, I go to the Chicano Education, where the Chicano Lounge in Monroe...
- D: In Monroe?
- C: Yeah. And I don't feel like I fit in. I don't.
- D: You don't feel like you fit in with the Hispanics?
- C: Exactly.
- D: How about the English-speaking?

- C: I don't feel like I fit in. I mean, when I would go to Mexico, or if I would go to Mexico, I don't think they would accept me, because I'd be too Anglicized, or too Americanized, you know. I've been living in the United States too long.
- D: Tell me something about the culture. I'm not that familiar with the Hispanic culture, but I understand there's a distinction between Mexican, Chicano. Explain that a little bit more to me, and how you fit into that. Give me some background on that first.
- C: Okay. Well, I guess it's just name, what you would label yourself. Chicano, what people consider Chicano or Chicana, is some one that has, is a, by, uh, their parents are Mexicano, but they grew up, they were born, in the United States. And they...I don't know....they prefer...they label themselves with Chicanos, 'cause they don't want to be known as Mexicanos.
- D: They don't want to be known as Mexicanos?...
- C: No, because they weren't born in Mexico. I mean, they're from the States. So, I'm a Mexicano....I, I don't know...I'm really more Chicano...because I'm a Mexicano; my parents are Mexicanos; I'm going to die being a Mexicana.
- D: Were you born there?
- C: No, I was born here.
- D: So, technically, some people would label you Chicana.
- C: Yeah, but I don't label myself Chicana...
- D: You consider yourself?...
- C: ...because I'm a Mexicana. I mean, you know. Someone being born in, you know, their parents are from Sweden, I mean, you can't say that... You know what I mean?
- D: Mm mm.
- C: They, I mean, I know, everyone's an American, 'cause we're living here, but...um...That's what the two

distinctions...And the older, the older generation, the Mexicanos, they really look down on the people that call themselves Chicanos or Chicanas, because they're trying to get away from their roots...

D: Yes?

C: ...of who they really are...

D: They feel the ones who label themselves Chicano...

C: Yeah, they don't wanna, you know...They don't want to be Mexicanos, so they're...

D: So then, you...and you sound like you want to stay tied to your roots?

C: Yeah. I am a Mexicana. There's, I mean, there's nothing that I can do about it.

D: Does that come from growing up in a Hispanic home, or from speaking the language, or the culture, or what?

C: Well, you know what. At first, growing up in Othello, there was an Hispanic population, not as big as it is right now. But I want to fit in like anyone else. So, what I did is, you know, I tried, I was in the cheer leading squad. I was the only Mexicana. Everyone else was white. So, I wanted to fit in with everyone. And I didn't want to be known as...I didn't want to be different. So, all my friends were, they weren't Hispanic. And, I mean, I didn't choose that. I mean, I wasn't trying to be prejudiced or anything. But I, um, just wanted to fit it, and, just one day, looked at myself, and I'm going, "Who am I kidding? I am not, I'm not gonna ever be, and I'm never gonna be like them. I'm gonna be, I'm a Mexicana, so I might as well just face it," after that, so, and you know, and be proud of myself.

D: Was that a let...I was going to say, I was going to ask if that was a letdown.

C: Yeah. I felt like I was cheating myself. I felt like I wasn't...that who I was wasn't good enough, and I was going, "No, I need to be happy with who I am."

- D: So up to that point you had felt outside the Mexicano?...
- C: Yeah. Even with my friends, being in the cheer leading squad, I felt like an outsider, and...
- D: What happened at that point, once you made that decision? Did it make a difference?
- C: When I was in the squad, or?...
- D: No. When you made a decision that you were not going to try to be...non-Hispanic?
- C: Uh. I came to terms. I'm happy with myself.
- D: Yeah?
- C: I'm happy with myself. I'm, I am proud of being a Mexicano. There's nothing wrong with that. There's nothing wrong with being part of your heritage. That's who I am, and I can't deny that.
- D: I grew up with some heritages, too, so I know what you're talking about...
- C: Yeah. Exactly. Exactly.
- D: You pronounce your name?
- C: Say-lyuh.
- D: Say-lee-uh?
- C: Say-lyuh.
- D: Which is the Hispanic, which is the Spanish pronunciation?
- C: Right.
- D: Have you always done that?
- C: Uh, no, not always. That's going back to where I had to make a decision. And I always say my name Say-lyuh Raw-me-rez. That's how it's pronounced.
- D: And at one point it was?
- C: Seal-yuh.
- D: Seal-yuh?
- C: Yeah. Seal-yuh.
- D: And how did you pronounce [last name deleted for anonymity].

- C: [deleted]. And I was being a hypocrite. And usually I was...“I gotta do something.” Yeah. And that's how I...
- D: How old were you when you decided that?
- C: I think I was like, um...I think it was in high school, when I knew that it was, everything that I tried to do would never...I mean, I could never change, you know, who I was. So, I decided I might as well come to terms with...
- D: Did it make a difference in how people responded to you?
- C: Um...
- D: That you could tell?
- C: I think so, because they, they accepted me for who I was. I wasn't going to deny who I was. I was Mexicana. And there was a lot of my friends who would tell me, “You're not like the others.” That bothered me.
- D: Which friends?
- C: My non-Hispanic friends...I don't know what to call them: Anglos, whites...
- D: Well, because, because Hispanics are whites, too...
- C: Yeah. Exactly.
- D: So, I say, your non-Hispanic friends would say, “You're not like the others,” meaning, “You're not like the other non-Hispanics,” or “You're not like the other...”
- C: “You're not like the His...the other Hispanics.” And that really bothered me. Yeah, I mean, “You're not like the others,” and I never really...
- D: Did you ever figure that one out?...
- C: No. I didn't. You know, everyone takes it differently, and I didn't know how they meant it. So, I just kinda...
- D: Did you ever just say, “I'm Celia”?
- C: Yeah. I mean, like me for who I am. You know, it doesn't matter a color. I mean, I like you for who you are.

- D: Well, that one thing I've always noticed about you, is you just...There's nobody quite like this person. Yeah. Your very calm individuality...
- C: Yeah...
- D: Intense, but sometimes...I'm a...Do I need anything else from you? Uh. Give me just a moment. Let me get my thought here for just a moment. With all that deciding, working through, and you decided you were, at one point, you were being a hypocrite, trying to be one thing and deciding you were really who you are, regardless, you know, regardless of language, culture, whatever, did you ever put negatives or positives on any of that?...
- C: Of, um,...
- D: Any negative feelings or positive feelings or say, "This is good. This is bad. This I don't want. This I'd rather be." You know, anywhere in the last 28 years?
- C: Um, yeah. Because, growing up, still my mom and dad have a negative attitude towards the Mexicanos.
- D: Towards the Mexicanos?
- C: Yeah, yeah. Um...
- D: Even though they insist on the His...on the Spanish language?
- C: Right. Even though everyone, you know, there's good and bad in everyone, I mean, it doesn't, regardless of race, religion, or whatever. Um. So that really, it kinda rubbed off on me. And then, I would see the Mexicanos from Mexico, and, you know, you kinda have a animosity there, because you're from the States, and then, you know, they're coming here, kinda invading your territory, so to speak. So. But, uh, no, not any more. I try not to. I try not. But, I just look at it,...
- D: So, you try not to. Does it still slip in once and a while?



- C: Once in a while it does. But, I need to know, well I need to, well, we need to know that everyone, we're people and everyone, you know, regardless of color. It doesn't really matter.
- D: That's interesting, only because this book that I'm reading onto tape is not all glory for any of the leaders of this country. And I just finished reading a chapter onto tape on the, uh, on the Mexican-American War. And it's not complimentary to how the U. S. stepped into that situation.
- C: Oh, yeah, or like how the Alamo. That was disgust...I was disgusted.
- D: But, but, even with all that, all that historical knowledge, you still felt some animosity toward the Mexicans, the Mexicanos.
- C: Yeah. Well, I'm not gonna blame my parents. I mean I can think for myself. But now it's, you know...
- D: How about toward \_\_\_\_\_?
- C: At times...Well, no, not really. I've kinda worked through that, because, I don't know. I think everyone has their prejudices; it may be towards fat people, or, you know, deaf people, handicapped, you know.
- D: You were born here?
- C: Uh huh.
- D: How long had your folks been here?
- C: Oh, I would say thirty-five years.
- D: Before you were born?
- C: Yeah. They were here like thirty-five, thirty years.
- D: And they had come when they were adults or children?
- C: My dad, he came, and he was like eighteen. He came across the border. And then, my mom came later.
- D: So, you're Hispanic, but you were born north of the border, and...
- C: Exactly.
- D: Born in Othello?
- C: Mm mm.

- D: So, you were born into that situation and grew up with it from the very beginning, huh?
- C: Yeah. Exactly.
- D: Okay. Well, I think that's all I need right now. That's going to give me some things to work with. I'm, uh...One more though.
- C: Uh huh?
- D: Did you have any troubles going back and forth between the two languages? How did you function between the two languages? Did you keep them separately, work with them together? How did you do that?
- C: Um. Growing up as a child, you know how children they're remarkable.
- D: Yes?
- C: No, I never...
- D: Remarkable how?
- C: Because they're able to think, to decipher. When I was interpreting for my parents, I mean I did it when I was really small. And I was able to take the English, code it, decode it, or whatever, and then, and then say it in the Spanish vernacular.
- D: Was there any point where there was just one language, English-Spanish. Or was all Spanish, and then English came in, or do you remember any?...
- C: I think it was all Spanish. Then English came in. And now it's...
- D: How did you separate that out, or did you? How did you deal with that? Do you remember back, I mean, that, that's a way, that's way back. Do you remember how you dealt with it?
- C: Uh, oh gosh, no. Like, right now, um, I'm doing a...I want to do a paper on Chicano code-switching. It's like, whenever I talk, I, like, talk to anyone, and whenever I say, "Have you heard of the earthquakes in Loas Anghehless?" I don't say Los Angeles. I say

- Loas Anghehless. So, there's a combination of both that I do. Or, um, you know, or whenever I relate to my family or to church, I always tend to speak in Spanish, because I tend to relate more in Spanish....
- D: Well, even just an example, here you've been saying, you refer to Meheeco...
- C: Yeah, Meheeco.
- D: Meheecanos, uh, Meheecanos. Uh, that's what they call themselves. That's, some people would say, "That's their name. That's what they call themselves. That's the valid name."
- C: Mm mm.
- D: How do you feel? You mentioned code-switching. Would you prefer to speak in whatever language, pronounce the names, even, in whatever language you're speaking?
- C: Oh, I think that's the correct way. I don't know that, because to me, saying Mexicans, that sounds really odd for me...
- D: But what about, say, Loas Anghehless?
- C: Loas Anghehless?
- D: Yeah. How about that, something like that?
- C: I would say in Spanish, because I, it's, it's spelled in Spanish.
- D: It's a Spanish name.
- C: Yeah. It's Loas Anghehless. And I relate to it better, because that's how I would pronounce it in Spanish. And it is written in Spanish, so say it in Spanish.
- D: That's why I would ask. So those things...Do you code-switch on anything else, just general terms?
- C: Just general terms. Like, whenever I'm talking to my brothers or sisters, we talk in English. Right? But whenever we start talking about Mom or Dad or when we were younger, we code, or we switch back to Spanish, because we can relate to Spanish, or we can relate to that situation more in Spanish.

- D: So, you're using different languages for different purposes...
- C: Yeah. Exactly. Exactly.
- D: ...and different situations?
- C: And, then, whenever I talk about school, I go back to English.
- D: With your brothers and sisters, you just switch back and forth.
- C: Yeah. Yeah. We go back and forth.
- D: Do you ever switch like that with other Spanish-speaking friends and associates, or with other English-speaking friends and associates?
- C: Um. With like, maybe, like, the Hispanics, because when I was small, growing up, we used to work out in the fields every summer. And whenever we talk about our experiences, we tend to talk in Spanish.
- D: Yes.
- C: And, but, with, like, my, the English-speaking native-English-speakers, I just go and talk to them in English, or whatever.
- D: Without code-switching?
- C: Maybe, if I would say Loas Anghehless...
- D: A name?
- C: Exactly. But if my experiences are in English, so I kinda would just tend to bond with them that way.
- D: Thank you.
- C: Oh, you're welcome

## Appendix B

Interview on Bilingualism  
conducted by  
David W. Trotter  
February, 1994

Subject: Leonore

Age: 23

Education: At time of interview: Was one quarter away from completing a BA at EWU in Social Work and Sociology

D: The first thing I just need to know is I need your full name; I need your name.

L: Okay. Leonore. O-Nore.

D: [Last name deleted for anonymity]?

L: [deleted].

D: How old are you?

L: Twenty-three.

D: Okay. Uh. Tell me a little about...You grew up in a bilingual family?

L: Uh-huh.

D: And tell me a little about that.

L: Um. Both my parents mainly spoke Spanish. Their native language was Spanish.

D: Where was this?

L: Central America?

D: Oh, you grew up in Central America?

L: Oh, well, we traveled a lot, so...um...I was born in California. And then, when I was about five, we moved to Germany, 'cause my dad was in the military. And so, I learned another language, which I forgot, though. Um...Then...um...We lived there for about three years, and moved to Central America.

D: Where?

L: El Salvador.  
D: Okay.  
L: Then we moved...um...We lived there for about a year. Then we moved to...um...California again. And, I guess when I was really small, before we moved to Germany, we moved. We lived in Texas, in Corpus Christi, Texas. But I don't remember that very much. Um. And then, we ended up here, in Washington.  
D: How old were you when you came to Washington?  
L: Um. I was in fifth grade, so probably like ten.  
D: So by the time you were in fifth grade, you had lived in California, what part?  
L: Los Angeles.  
D: Okay. And Germany for three years.  
L: Central America.  
D: El Salvador. Back to California.  
L: I moved also, Texas.  
D: Texas. You came here when you, here being where, Spokane or...?  
L: Oh, no. Lakewood.  
D: Lakewood!  
L: Tacoma. Hm. Hm.  
D: I grew up in Parkland.  
L: Oh!  
D: A few years before you lived there. But, uh, do you remember? How did you...You said your parents spoke mainly Spanish?  
L: Hm. Hm. They spoke to me in Spanish. And my grandfather lives with us, too.  
D: Still?  
L: No, um, not anymore, no. But he did all up until, um, I was in my sophomore year in high school. So he lived with us until then. Um. So he lived with us, and he spoke to me mainly in English, and both my parents spoke to me in Spanish.

- D: How did he happen to be speaking English, and the next generation was primarily Spanish?
- L: He is my, um, he's my father's, um, my real father's step-dad.
- D: Yeh.
- L: But he just raised us, and so it's just like our, uh, biological grandfather. And he was Russian.
- D: Oh.
- L: He was Russian, but he never spoke to us in Russian. He spoke to us in English, 'cause he was raised here in the United States.
- D: So you grew up with English and Spanish...
- L: Hm. Hm.
- D: both at home?
- L: Hm. Hm.
- D: Did that ever cause any confusion for you?
- L: Uh, no until we came back to the States. It never caused any confusion, confusion at all, um, in any of the schools. My classwork was average, just like every other kid. But when we went to Germany, I had acquired a third language. So when I came back to the States, um, because I was in a German school...They just put me into a German school, so I...It was just kinda like...
- D: In Germany?
- L: Yeh, in Germany. And so, I had to learn Germ...I had to learn the language in order to do well in school. So I guess I spoke it really well; my mom says I spoke it very fluently. um. And then I came back to the States, I remember that the teacher told my mom that I need to forget...Well, the tea...There was a counselor, a teacher, and a principle that came to our house one day. And they said, um, that it was causing problems for me at school, because I was forgetting words and I was putting in German words or Spanish words. In term of when I was talking, I would forget a word, and

if it couldn't come out immediately, then I would speak another word from a different language, the same word I was looking for but a different language. So, um, then my mom didn't emphasize German anymore, because she used to speak to me in German after...

D: She knew German?

L: After we learned it. Hm. Hm.

D: So she had learned it over there, too?

L: My whole family did. And, um, and when we learned it, it just kinda stuck with the family, but, 'cause she didn't want me to forget it. But then she quit speaking it to me, because of the fact that the principal of the school assumed that it was causing problems in school. But I think it only happened, I mean, from what I can remember, it only happened a couple of times, that you couldn't, sometimes it's like the word's on the tip of your tongue, and I would just sit there and go, "What is the word?" But it was just, um, because I'd just recently arrived in the United States from Germany. So...

D: And you were how old at that time?

L: Mm. I was probably, um, I don't remember. I was in elementary school sometime.

D: So, growing up, you...and I asked if it was, if it caused any confusion. Did you switch back and forth between the languages, or did you use them each independently, or how did you use the languages growing up?

L: Um. At home, it was mainly Spanish, unless I was speaking with my grandfather, which was English. And then, in school and around the community, it was English, just complete English. Um. With my family, and it still is 'til this day, we could go in my house with Spanish; my church was Spanish; everything I do is Spanish. But when I'm at school, at work,



everywhere else it's English. And it doesn't cause any confusion. It's just, um, it grew, it just, that's how you were raised. You know. It's like, if you spoke to your dad in English, you're not going to go and speak to him in Spanish. I don't know. It's kinda like forcing...

D: Where did you...When do you remember realizing that you were using more than one language?

L: Um. Because I was like that, I got taught how to read and write in English in kindergarten. I remember, I wanted to learn how to do it in Spanish, and um, so by that time, I already knew that I had, that I had acquired two languages. But, um, I taught myself how to read it when I was in kindergarten. My mom bought, bought books from Central America, and she had them send us books, like, um, school books. And so, they sent us school books, and then I just taught it to myself, and my mom taught it to me. So. At the same time, I was pushing her to teach me how to tell time.

D: In Spanish?

L: Yeh. In Spanish and in English. That one was rough then. So, both of 'em. Um. But, yeh, that's...I mean, it never, it doesn't seem, it never seemed any, you know, to think about it, "Well, I know two languages." It just kinda was like natural. I mean, I didn't see myself as being different from other kids, because, I don't know, you know, for I knew, they could be speaking some other, some other language, um, at home, too.

D: Of course. But even at home, you spoke two languages...

L: Two.

D: And you knew which one to speak to whom?

L: Hm. Hm.

D: From the beginning, as far as you know?

L: Hm. Hm. Hm. Hm. Yeh, from the beginning, because of the fact that, um, my grandpa always spoke to me in English. So ever since I knew how to speak, it was,

from my grandfather to me was English, from my parents to me was Spanish, and from my relatives to me was Spanish. So that's how I distinguished it from my family to my grandpa.

D: I lost what I was thinking.

L: Oh.

D: That might be just the point. Um. Well, your grandfather. You said he was reared in this country.

L: Hm. Hm.

D: Did he, does he have any accent? Did he have any accent?

L: Mm. No.

D: Not Russian? Not Spanish from being around Hispanics?

L: Nn. Nn. Nn. Nn. He, um, nowadays he can forget, um, he has forgotten a lot of his, um, Russian, a lot of the Russian. But, um, when he went to church, he went to a Russian church. Well, uh, we all went to an American church, but within the American church, there was different, um, there were different languages. So he went to the Russian portion of it, and we went to the Spanish portion. There was Russian, German, and Spanish and English.

D: This was in, oh this wasn't in Germany?

L: No. This was here in the United States.

D: This was in the United States.

L: California. And so, um, I remember that nobody could tell he, he didn't have an accent, from what I heard other people talking, 'cause I don't know to speak Germ, uh, Russian. So, um, so I couldn't tell if he had an accent or not. But from what other people said, was that he was just, you know, they couldn't believe that he was raised here, due to the fact that he had no accent.

D: No Anglo accent for his Russian?

- L: Hm. Hm. Yeh. And no, uh, Russian accent when he spoke English.
- D: How's your Spanish?
- L: Mm. Same as my English. People, um, they, when I meet them, and if I meet them in like my family setting, say some one's having, um, then, um, some people have even asked me if I, if I know how to speak English, because of the fact that I don't have an accent, an English accent when I'm speaking Spanish. Um. Some of the times, though, I forget, like, I'll forget a word type thing. But I won't substitute. I just sit there and try to think about it. And I know how to read it and write it and speak it, obviously. And so, it just, it just comes natural.
- D: You say you won't substitute a word from another language?
- L: Nn. Nn.
- D: You used to.
- L: Yeh, I used to when I was younger.
- D: What changed that?
- L: Well, obviously, that slap on the wrist. Professor, or from the teachers and the, um... You know, that was a big mistake, I think, because...
- D: With what? Who's mistake?
- L: Their mistake. Because of the fact that I would be trilingual and, you know, valued as three people, instead of only two. You know. I mean, because, you know, you're, you're, you're valued, you're not valued, but you are, you serve for two different cultures type thing. You know. You serve for the American culture, and you serve for the Spanish culture, 'cause you can communicate with both. And if I knew how to speak German as well still, um, if my family would continue, would have continued to speak to me in German, then I would have learned, learned and known it very well by this time, and I could have

communicated with other people, like in a third culture. And since, um, they told my family, my family didn't want me to be different, they didn't want me to, um, like, half stick out like a sore thumb or be retarded or anything in school, so they, um, they stopped speaking to me in German.

D: But they kept speaking to you in Spanish?

L: Hm. Hm. Because, um, just kinda force of habit, I guess.

D: Did the schools say anything about the Spanish?

L: Um. No. Because. See, the problem was I was speaking more. I would substitute more German words than Spanish words. And when we came back and they enrolled me back in school, that's when I was having trouble kind of, you know, going from speaking, going from an all-German school and speaking German all day long, and Spanish, so I spoke German and Spanish over there, and a little bit of English to my grandpa, to coming to the States and then speaking all English, being in a all-Anglo-American, you know, all-Anglo school, speaking just English, and it was just hard, the transition. I mean, you know, if you go to Austria and you pick up an accent, you acquire this little accent, you come back here, you have to get kind of, you know, back into the mode of things. I mean, you don't just snap out of it and, oh, you know, "Okay, I'm fine now, and I'm not, I don't have that accent that I picked up from, you know, from living there for a couple of years."

D: You said you didn't want to sti...,that your family didn't want you to stick out like a sore thumb.

L: Hm. Hm.

D: And you've also said that you, uh...Did you, did you ever feel like you were different?

L: Um. Well, when I went to...I didn't ever feel like I was different, because when I went to Central America and

when I lived there, I got put in a private school. And so I, um, they taught English. And so it was an English, an Americanized school, but...

D: You say they taught English or they taught in English?

L: No. They taught English. And so, it was, um, you had English, and you learned another foreign language, as well as they spoke in Spanish. So, it would be kinda like a junior high school here. You know how you take, you take your English classes. And so that that was just the regular classes; that was like Spanish classes. And then, you have your extra foreign language. But, then, on top of that, they taught you a main language, which was, which was English, like one of the big languages, 'cause almost everybody knows a little bit of English over there in Central America.

D: What did you, what was the other language you studied?

L: Uh. German. Yeh. So that, because I knew that we were, um, we were gonna one day move back, uh, whatever, whatever.

D: Have you ever been back to Germany?

L: Nope! Never.

D: Yeh. I haven't been there in twenty-one years. Um. But, uh, I'm trying to think. So, you...Where was this? What school system in did they ask you to stop speaking German?

L: Um. The Lakewood.

D: What was the name of the school?

L: Lakeview Elementary. And, um so I was really wronged...

D: Clover Park School District?

L: Hm. Hm. Clover Park School District. Yep. And that was really wrong. I mean, because I think, now, I think that they would encourage it a little bit more and try to work with you, maybe put you in an ESL class for a

little while, and then get you out of there, and then get you back in the swing of things.

D: Have you ever thought about going back and completing learning German?

L: Um. Yeh. Everyone told me to do it, because, um, I can remember somewhat, some words and things like that. But, and, sometimes, when people are around me in conversation, I can pick up little bits and pieces, but I can't, I speak German anymore.